

# du bois nat'l office robbed

**du bois statement**  
The DuBois Clubs of America have been the victim of an ultra right attack. We have been unwilling or unable to give them the protection they deserve. Last March, at 11:00 hours after Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach launched a vicious federal attack against the DuBois Clubs, the DuBois Clubs' National Office in San Francisco was bombed and burned. The criminals behind the attack have never been apprehended.

Last night, July 28, 1966, the new National Office in Chicago was broken into and robbed. All mailing lists, federal tax records, letters and other documents containing names and address were stolen. Because our valuable equipment was not taken, it is clear that the robbery was staged in order to seize our names and addresses for future harassment. In March, a government attack was followed by violence against the DuBois Clubs. Will this new violence be followed with a new government attack?

It is no surprise that these crimes are allowed to continue. It is part of the general attack against the movement - the rapid rise of KKK activity in the South, the growing police violence in the Northern ghettos and the increasing Federal harassment and intimidation of any group demanding a change in American life.

The purpose of an intensified attack at this time is clear. It is an attempt to destroy our efforts to organize the National Action in Washington, D. C. on August 27th & 28th which is sponsored by the DuBois Clubs, Students for a Democratic Society, the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee and the Southern Student Organizing Committee.

But we will not be stopped. Our national action is generating an enthusiastic response in the movement. Black communities, in white communities through the nation. On Monday, August 1, we announced a bold new campaign to confront the President of the United States with his policies of terror against the ghettos of our land.

To mobilize Black Power, White Workers Power - the Power of the People against the power of this society, we will march on the White House to TELL IT TO JOHNSON in a voice so loud and so strong that he can no longer ignore it.

Yours in Struggle,  
The DuBois Clubs' National Office

## clarification on d.c. action

The question of the relation of SDS to the DuBois Clubs' action in Washington on August 27-28 has been raised again in several instances. Local SDS groups on the West Coast and in New York have been contacted by DuBois Clubs members to work on this project and have been told that National SDS was co-sponsoring the event. In addition, the above press statement by the DuBois Clubs expressly states that the National Action is being sponsored by SDS.

SDS is not sponsoring this event and representatives of the National Administrative Committee have consistently made that fact very clear in dealing with the DuBois Clubs. There should not exist, nor should there have existed, any ambiguity about this question.

## radicalism:

by Max Gordon

In New Left Notes of June 10, Stanley Aronowitz suggests that the history of relations between the labor movement and the Left of the thirties and forties should teach us that radicalism has to avoid the mistakes of the Old Left. Reviewing this history, he writes that the destruction of the Left in the labor movement was due to its failure to build a core of radical sympathy on the basis of its own rank-and-file strong program, as against the "rank-down" which followed World War I. He attributes this to the fact that the Left subordinated itself to the New Deal and the leadership of the labor movement to build an independent base

**sds statement**  
In expressing its deep concern over this latest attack on the DuBois Clubs of America, the NAC of SDS calls on its members to help DuBois in reconstituting its files by supplying any information which might help them in this task.

## sds statement

Students for a Democratic Society wishes to express, with a deep sense of urgency, its concern over the burglary of the membership files of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America last Thursday evening. As an organization deeply committed to the struggle for human rights in a democratic society, SDS considers any attack on the civil liberties of any organization a direct threat to the entire movement for basic social change.

The most recent crime against the DuBois Clubs is not the first example of harassment nor is it likely to be the last. The DuBois Clubs and the Vietnam Day Committee have had their offices bombed in San Francisco and Berkeley, a member of the Socialist Workers' Party was murdered in Detroit, and scores of crimes have been perpetrated against civil rights workers.

In addition, it must be pointed out that the government has indirectly created an atmosphere conducive to such crimes by its attacks on political and antiwar organizations, its attempts to discredit all dissent within the country, and its systematic creation of a national war psychology designed to build support for the unjust and unpopular war which it is waging against the Vietnamese people. Most recently, in Indianapolis, Indiana, on July 23, the administration made clear that the anti-war movement was to be further silenced by the arrest, or threat, of Secret Service agents, of 29 peace demonstrators exercising their constitutional rights of public protest during a French speaking tour in that city. The direct result of this national administration of suppression of civil liberties marks a more blatant step in the destruction of political freedom. The willingness of the government to tolerate individual repression is a crucial failure of its vision, the encouragement of such repression has directly at its core the destruction of our democracy and the building of a totalitarian state. The government bears a deep responsibility for what happened in the DuBois Clubs office Thursday night.

It is important that the public not dismiss such incidents as the inevitable gangsterism of isolated fanatics. The person or persons who burglarized the DuBois Clubs did so with very clear political motives - the acquisition of the membership lists and files - and with a care and deliberation which can only be described as professional. The public need only ask itself who would have an interest in acquiring such information to see the ramifications of the act. Given the limitations of present evidence, it is not yet possible to identify the culprit. We demand that the government intervene to protect the rights of all citizens by launching an investigation of this crime and by bringing to justice those who were responsible for similar actions in the past. Should the government fail in this, it will implicate itself over more deeply in the destruction of democratic institutions and declare itself the ally of those forces which seek to undermine political freedom in this country. We seriously doubt that the government will act any more effectively in this case than it has in the past, and will further condemn itself in the eyes of all concerned Americans.

## old and new

for their own ideas." The critique is a bit puzzling in one respect since Aronowitz appears to identify the Old Left with the Communist Party, yet does not explain why he does not consider this to have been an "independent luse for their own ideas." In essence, however, he is attacking the coalition tactic of the Old Left and charging this with responsibility for its decline.

History, if objectively examined, can undoubtedly be useful in helping to shape programs and tactics. It can hardly serve this purpose if it is distorted to bolster programs and concepts already formulated.

(continued on page 31)

# electoral politics: ncnp

by John Maher

Boston, Mass.

The simple mathematics of American politics suggests that SDS would be foolish to ignore the fact that many millions of our fellow citizens are to the right of us. Thus I agree with Paul Booth and Lee Webb when they argue that SDS must maintain and encourage a dialogue with concerned liberals. Through this dialogue many liberals may become radicals, others may come to see that insofar as they are concerned about ending the war SDS is a sound investment because it can deliver the goods. But there is an important distinction to be made between dialogue and coalition, just as we must distinguish between the situations when it is appropriate to emphasize our separate identity as radicals, and when it is appropriate to submerge it.

Were my only source of information the articles in New Left Notes, I would be considerably less skeptical than I am now about the possibility for a coalition with concerned liberals within the framework of the National Council for a New Politics. A systematic inquiry has convinced me of three things: (1) the staff of the NCNP is totally incompetent; (2) the staff of the NCNP has abused

its position in a way extremely detrimental to the movement, (3) liberals and radicals do not on the whole share the common political perspective necessary for the Board of Directors of the NCNP to rationally allocate funds between different kinds of projects. Let me elucidate.

(1) My awakening began when I found myself among the 25 participants at a conference at Ann Arbor whose announced aim had been to attract and train 1000 activists from across the country. But, for example, none of the 35(!) peace campaigns in California had been contacted, and the same sloppy organizing was the rule from coast to coast. Bob Scheer showed up uninvited, and mad as hell, for good reasons. Scheer and Ivanhoe Donaldson from SNCC, an outfit which has shown a considerable amount of sophistication lately on this question of coalition, initiated a process of inquiry the results of which I will attempt to summarize.

(2) Scheer complained that his name had been used to solicit funds for the NCNP (continued on page 2)

## new left notes

an internal newspaper of students for a democratic society

1000, rm. 206

chicago, ill. 60612

No. 29

let the people decide

August 5, 1966

## money, mail, and addresses

ATTENTION! All those who like to read NLN should be sending New Left Notes to the address on the back of the last issue. If you have not done so, please do so now. If you have, please do so again in the fall.

This is written at 5 a.m. I have just finished pulling all the addressograph plates for Williams College (Mass.) and Reed College (Ore.). These plates belonged to people who left their school addresses at the end of the spring term. When NLN No. 18 reached the school, it was sent back by the Post Office. It just got here, and let us know those addresses aren't any good any more - but we're not downhearted - we know that only 10 issues have gone out since then and they'll only cost us 10¢ a copy return postage (plus the original cost of mailing). That's a small price to pay in order to save an SDS member the cost of a 4¢ change-of-address card. So far, it hasn't gone too far over \$500 for summer address changes, but there's more to come.

Some of you, of course, did send in change of address notices, and got very slow service in getting the paper to your new address. This is due to a number of reasons - staff inefficiency (mine), failure of people to tell us where they were moving from (we really don't have the names and addresses of all 6000 of you memorized, no matter how hard we try), an immense backlog of old membership applications and changes of address from when we had no membership secretary, etc. Mainly it was due to the laziness and stupidity of your fellow members, who kept us tied up checking thru returned papers when we should have been servicing you. This particularly unfortunate in view of the fact that a number of people not only supplied us with prompt and accurate address changes, but told us where they would be in the fall and what they could do over the summer. They got screwed. Because of the immense workload of address changes and returned papers, we were unable to keep track of all that.

THIS MEANS THAT THOSE WHO WANT NEW LEFT NOTES IN THE FALL MUST SEND IN CHANGE OF ADDRESS NOTICES, EVEN IF YOU ALREADY DID. They should be sent a week or two before you move, should include zip codes, be legibly printed (PRINTED - not appreciation of calligraphy has been dulled), they should NOT use common local abbreviations of street names (they mean! common to the Post Office, believe us), and above all, they should not assume that we know what city and state logically follows the name of your college or dorm. Also

note to New Yorkers: there are other cities with an "East 44th Street" please add NYC and your zip code. If you don't bother to write down the city, we had to process about 100 changes of address which really weren't this time, and some people missed issues while their old plates were removed and new ones typed - with the same address.

In case all this seems rather academic to you, it won't if the NC accepts my motion to send NLN only to people who want it enough to send us their names and addresses. This would mean that when we got a copy back, we would simply pull the old addressograph plate, junk it, and not bother to plate the new address.

Love  
Tom Candi

## on being a non-editor

It is not without certain hesitations that I embark on the rewarding but difficult task of editing New Left Notes. It must be one of the most unusual editorial tasks in the world of journalism, but the New Left needs to do things in new and unusual ways. Organizing students was difficult because it involved teaching people to lead without becoming the leader. Organizing the poor involves teaching people about power with out imposing an ideology. Editing New Left Notes means encouraging people to write about issues of serious concern without encouraging any one viewpoint; it means being a non-editor, or, perhaps, being something like the teacher student in a free university.

This week's issue of New Left Notes is the largest to date. That is because of the unusually large amount of copy arriving at my desk before the Convention. It is copy from a wide variety of viewpoints from an expression of concern over the danger of alienating ourselves from the universe to a program for organizing ghetto youth in guerrilla gangs. All that falls within the broad spectrum of SDS. It is also the first issue of NLN to be edited by a non-editor and who should not be taken too seriously. HIS PERSONAL POLITICAL VIEWPOINTS ARE BE

P.S. It is not the duty of the editor to publish anyone's name who writes to the editor.

## chapter discussion

for a reply that would come in the same spirit of the I. C. discussion on the Aptheker strike. It seemed a rather clear-cut question as to whether or not Jane should lend her name to a national call of well-known figures promoting a student strike. However, in the heat of the ensuing discussion involved issues ranging from the effectiveness of another demonstration, to the real meaning and commitment behind the word "strike" in the traditional labor movement sense. The discussion led us into opinions from SDS finally taking a responsible voice in the actions and affairs of its 7,000, to the need for articulating and distinguishing the differences between the old and new left. And the arguments ranged from disparate views of human nature and man's capacities for both responsibility and negligence, to differing views as to how our energies could be not only effective, but convincingly used to persuade and effect revolutionary changes in our society. So we ended up discussing several complicated and vital issues in depth, but without necessarily getting any closer to answering the "clear-cut" question we had been asked to decide.

I explain this from the beginning, because it is important to understand that even though we concluded with one final resounding chord of differing opinions, the process from beginning to that end was an intense and complicated fugue of separate ideas counterpoint one another. Let me say that before launching out into the reasoning that finally became our decisions, the vote was very close:

- 6 against J's signing
- 4 agreed
- 3 abstentions

The six votes opposed to Jane's lending her name to such a "call" were cast on the grounds that the call was an undemocratic method, in which decision-making was done by a few elite, and the leg work by those who may or may not have put their adrenaline to more effective use. The real point here being that if an authentic student strike were to take place in this country by "the overwhelming sentiment (of) young people that (thought) the war in Vietnam must be ended" then that great multitude should have proposed, developed and been willing to carry out such a strike. The people who were of this persuasion felt strongly the need

for decentralized organizing in which decisions and proposals are made from their original sources and real local needs rather than from an abstract administrative body which pretends to represent, but in reality has no broadly based, deeply-rooted, truly nation-wide contacts of sentiment. The four votes agreed to Jane's lending her name to the call were cast on the grounds that the issue and goal of ending the war were so overwhelmingly important and imperative that a compromise of methods and ideologies must be accomplished for the sake of our overall strength and effectiveness. A student from England who was quite active in the '50's Ban the Bomb movement, expressed the fears of many, I think, when he parolled our movement with theirs. He said he had watched a principled and powerful movement fall apart because of trivial differences of opinion on method while they all agreed that the goal must be obtained. The people of this persuasion felt strongly that a fractionalization of the already small left would irreparable damage and eventually kill a movement which should thrive. In other words, the sacrifice of a principle or method to these members seemed minimal when contrasting it to the possible sacrifice of the effective persuasion toward ending the war.

The three abstentions are the hardest to decipher because no reason for abstaining was actually discussed. As I see it, there may have been several explanations. One I am quite sure is that these people were torn between the two persuasions. What was really at stake? . . . Which principle was more important? . . . More Expedient? . . . More in keeping with long-range goals? I think also there was some confusion among these members as to whether a vote against Jane's signing made SDS's participation impossible, or whether a vote for Jane's signing made SDS's participation in such a strike imperative. In any case, I think these people were more relieved than any other faction when the next question -- should we discuss the strike -- came to a vote. The decision was a unanimous yes, which indicates, I hope, that the discussion had evolved made members of the complications, problems and decisions that had to be confronted and decided upon, even if only in their own minds.

Linda MacConaughy

## isolation

Regarding Bettino Aptheker's proposal for a student strike on November 4th, I have the following to say:

1) It seems to me that no call, tentative or otherwise, can be issued before the Convention. If a tentative call were issued, it would put pressure on the Convention to decide to endorse it rather than make an apparent reversal of policy. Consideration of the proposal on its merits would thus be inhibited.

2) Since I will not be at the Convention I would like to state now my position on the student strike. I oppose it, for the following reasons:

It is an action which is limited to students alone, tending to isolate them from the rest of the community. On the contrary, our policy should be one of involving students in the community to build a strong, unified base for opposition to the war and other questions.

It is not a particularly effective action. Students do not by themselves have any particular power; Johnson will not tremble at the thought of them not attending classes. Who cares? Nor is it likely that what will be regarded as student high jinks, if it receives any sizeable press coverage at all, will impress the general public as representing any massive opposition to the war. In short, I question the value of demonstrations that are not widely based or do not represent a distinct power threat.

As proposed, the suggestion is a completely negative one. We are disassociating ourselves from the war -- but with what are we associating ourselves? We reject the university -- what do we accept? The action proposed does not seem to be a useful and constructive one. Certainly by agreeing to such a vaguely formulated proposal we would not know to what we were committing ourselves.

On the above grounds I hope the Convention will decide against sponsorship of the strike and advise against it altogether, or substitute for it a more constructive program to be organized in a democratic way.

Judy Goodman

## human voices newsletter

Literature, particularly fiction, has increasingly in our century become the central medium for work in philosophy, social criticism, and collective and individual psychology. I, at least, and I think many others, find my major means of intellectual awareness discovering through the analysis of and writing of literature. As yet, the Movement's research and publication, such as it is, has almost solely been limited to social science and internal organizing problems. Therefore, it seems to me that ways should be found to make possible the achievement of the following goals: 1. The inter-communication and connection of groups and individuals now writing and studying socially concerned literature. 2. The production and publication of both original fiction, theatre, and poetry, and also essays of literary criticism. 3. The construction and publication of bibliographies, course and seminar outlines. 4. The distribution of studies made concerning the role of the artist in a movement, the relationship between individual rebellion and movement revolt. 5. The development of new agit-prop media and techniques. 6. The connection of people interested in such things with each other. Toward these ends, I would like to begin a newsletter (called Human Voices) that would try to begin accomplishing these 6 goals. Hopefully, the project would develop work that could be printed and distributed as separate pamphlets--short stories, criticism, and essays, and could organize conferences and seminars around the country, and find new ways of revolutionary activity and agitation. Interested people should write to me at

Human Voices Project  
Bill Vandercook  
SDS  
924 Howard St  
San Francisco, Calif 94103

# aptheker strike proposal

## alternative:

## vote for peace

On November 7 voters in most congressional districts throughout the country will not have a chance to vote for peace since both regular party candidates will be committed to the war. In those districts where there are genuine peace candidates on the ballot, SDS will be active in their support; but what course of action will be followed by SDS in these other areas?

A possible way to solve this problem would be to initiate a national vote for peace campaign with the NCNP and other groups. This campaign would include three basic steps:

(1) active participation in and support of the campaigns of genuine peace candidates where they are on the ballot.

(2) nomination of independent candidates where they are not on the ballot and where there are no genuine peace candidates. Since it will be virtually impossible to get these candidates on the regular ballot, the participating groups should establish a separate system of polling places, like the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party did in their early campaigns.

(3) coordination of the student vote for peace project on the nation's campuses. Ballot boxes would be set up on every campus and all students would be given the opportunity to vote for a peace candidate.

The vote for peace project would have these advantages: (1) All activity would be oriented toward potential action and would serve to build up independent radical constituencies. (2) The number of votes for peace would be increased because the choices would be available across the country. (3) The political effect of such a campaign would be felt by establishment candidates since this campaign would have an effect for the results even in those districts where the independent candidate is not on the ballot by (a) threatening to withhold thousands of votes which would otherwise go to the liberal candidate and (b) those voters who felt they had to vote for the lesser evil on the regular ballot could still cast a "Vote for Peace" at the peace ballot polling places. (4) There would be coordination between community and campus projects which would serve to create greater cooperation and cohesiveness between community and campus groups. (5) The values of participatory democracy would be served since everyone would have the opportunity to participate in the nomination, campaign, and even election of peace candidates.

Daniel Thomas  
Toledo SDS

## ncnp (cont)

his permission. Furthermore, the NCNP had not seen fit to share this "new politics" largesse with the Scheer campaign. I had threatened to take them to court. Scheer estimated that what he had finally received was considerably less than what he could have raised on the East Coast had not his name been appropriated. Brother Kissinger was dealt with similarly when the take from a large and successful fundraising party billed as a 50-50 split between Chicago CPA and the Morgan campaign was taken over by Paul Albert of the NCNP staff and given all to Morgan. Later NCNP threw Brother Kissinger a small bone, an which he is no doubt still gnawing. Brother Ansara from the Adams campaign fared yet worse. Arriving as instructed to give a 2 o'clock presentation to the Board he found that the meeting had been adjourned at 1:30. Not even a small bone for Brother Ansara.

The chief beneficiary of all this "new politics" was of course the Morgan campaign, described accurately and vividly in a recent issue of NLN. Besides executing their official duties, the staff of NCNP was active in soliciting contributions directly for the Morgan campaign from donors to the NCNP. Since the NCNP had failed totally in its feeble efforts to attract large liberal donors, these contributions came from people who are interested in SDS and SNCC, and who believed that by contributing to Morgan they were building a vital New Left in America. Thus it appears that while Morgan had no use for movement talent, he had ample access to movement money. This in itself suggests to me that SDS was taken for a ride.

(3) I do not mean to suggest, however, that liberals are in the whole greedy and untrustworthy. The most worthwhile hours of the Ann Arbor Conference were those spent airing the honest differences which separate today's radicals and concerned liberals. (a) whether bi-annual mobilizations are the most effective means to build a permanent political organization; (b) the extent to which elections are an effective means to bring pressure on the government; (c) whether the problems of poverty, inequality, and war can be solved within the framework of present American institutions. On these issues we agreed to disagree. Liberals and radicals present agreed also that an institution such as the NCNP could not provide some magic means to resolve these disagreements. Indeed, it became apparent that because the issue of allocating money had been so unwisely introduced the NCNP Board was hardly the place even to discuss them.

What we need now is more information about what is happening across the country and more opportunities for dialogue with radicals with different experiences and with concerned liberals -- what we do not need is a national coalition which pretends to speak for everyone. If the NCNP Board is willing to give up its pretensions, and new staff are brought in who can put together a few decent conferences and turn out a good newsletter, then so much the better. Failing in this, Booth and Webb should resign and SDS should be prepared to take the steps necessary to insure that we regain the exclusive use of our name in fund raising and in policy statements to the mass media.

If SDS is to exercise the leadership to which Paul Booth refers, SDS will need the freedom of action which on NCNP coalition precludes. Looking forward to 1968 I can see elements in the liberal peace movement falling for the same naive realpolitik about the necessity for "presenting the voters an alternative" at the national level, and forgetting that it takes the kind of organization we don't have now to make that alternative real. Or Bobby Kennedy may become the man of the hour, and SDS may have to deal with some real realpolitik. In any event if in the future SDS is going to make intelligent choices we will have to go about our business in a different way.

Looking back I believe that the NCNP fiasco could have been avoided if the SDS people involved, myself included, had followed the example of Mike Miller from SNCC and asked the same hard questions about who controlled what. Another mistake was that Brothers Booth and Webb acted largely on their own initiative and not under the supervision of some responsible body within SDS; had they reported in detail and submitted to a thorough questioning by the National Council or the National Forum Committee we all might have understood the implications of these actions much sooner than we did. The use of SDS' name in this regard is a matter I believe can be attributed largely to the absence of a dated page 1. I believe that the issue of SDS' name being permitted to do so was a matter of the lowest priority and can be avoided in the future.

The most striking fact about the survey, however, has to do with the positive perspective or the lack thereof. It is that the SNS tradition of being in the news continues on page 14.

# NATIONAL CONVENTION AGENDA

REGISTRATION BEGINS SATURDAY AFTERNOON, AUGUST 27. THE SPECIAL CONVENTION ISSUE OF NEW LEFT NOTES CONTAINING WORKING PAPERS AND STATEMENTS BY NATIONAL OFFICERS WILL BE DISTRIBUTED AT THAT TIME. A PARTY WILL BE HELD IN THE EVENING. ATTENTION: \$20.00 REGISTRATION INCLUDES THREE MEALS PER DAY AND BED FOR FIVE DAYS OF CONVENTION.

Aug. 28	Aug. 29	Aug. 30	Aug. 31
Morning: Panel Discussion* and Related Workshops	Workshops** not Related To Panel Discussions Non-plenary Panel	Impromptu Workshops Workshops Not Related to Panel Discussions Programmatic Workshops	First plenary session State of Organization Report by President, Nat'l Sec., officers of regional offices, and REP. These will be short summations of reports in special issue of NLN.
Afternoon: Panel Discussion*** and Related Workshops	Panel Discussion and Related Workshops	Panel Discussion and Related Workshops	Brief question and answer period, Adoption of convention agenda for next two days.****
Evening: Panel Discussion and Related Workshops	Impromptu Workshops and Workshops not related to Panels.	Impromptu and Programmatic Workshops	
<p>*GENERAL TOPICS FOR PANEL DISCUSSIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Electoral politics</li> <li>2. Black Power</li> <li>3. University as an Arena and as an Agent of Social Change</li> <li>4. United States Power and Third World Revolution</li> <li>5. Working with Liberal and Middle-class Groups</li> </ol>	<p>**SOME PRE-PLANNED WORKSHOPS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Violence and Non-Violence</li> <li>2. Relations with Labor Unions and Labor Organizing</li> <li>3. Art and the Movement</li> <li>4. Communism and Working with Communists</li> <li>5. Anti-communism as an Ideology</li> <li>6. Radical Education Project</li> <li>7. Assassination of President Kennedy</li> <li>8. Community Organizing theory and practice</li> <li>9. Vietnam Program</li> <li>10. Draft Program</li> </ol>	<p>***Each panel will be tape-recorded in full and a lengthy essay about the issues discussed will be written up and made public to SDS membership. Each workshop will have a recording secretary to take notes outlining different positions taken and the rationales for them.</p>	<p>****It is envisioned that the plenary sessions will break down into three areas of concern: consideration of resolutions and program proposals, constitutional amendments, and election of officers.</p> <p>All resolutions and program proposals should be submitted to the National Office before August 20 in order to be published in the Convention Issue of NLN. As required by the Constitution, amendments offered to the membership less than one month before the beginning of the Convention cannot take effect until the following Convention. All amendments received after Aug. 1 cannot go into effect until 1967 Convention. Such amendments, however, should be considered at this Convention and will also be published in Special Convention Issue of NLN.</p>

## propose constitutional amendments

The position of member at large at the national council be abolished except for the president, vice-president, and national secretary.

Eric Chester

Waban, Massachusetts

Could you please run in the next NLN, an additional proposal for a constitutional amendment: that the name of the organization be changed to Movement for a Democratic Society. A call for such a constitutional amendment was issued this spring by the Trinity College and Greater Hartford Chapters in accordance with constitutional requirements of a two-chapter sponsorship for all amendments. The New England Regional Spring Convention passed a resolution calling for such a change, and it was my understanding that the issue was raised at the last National Council meeting. The rationale for such a change is both to reflect the present fact that S.D.S. is to a large degree already not a purely student movement, and to facilitate growth of its non-student sector. It would make a significant difference in organizing as anyone involved in it will testify.

James Koplan

I have two major and three minor amendments to propose to the Constitution, the first one on behalf of myself and Bob Spack.

1. The first major amendment would change 3 sections of the Constitution, as follows: Article VI (National Council), section 1, change "seventeen national officers" to "seven national officers"; Article VII (National Interim Committee), change "the seventeen national officers" to "the seven national officers and one representative of each regional chapter"; Article V (National Officers and Staff), change the first sentence of section 1 to read "the national officers shall be the President, Vice-President, and five other members of the National Council." The second major amendment would change Article VI (National Council), section 1, change "seventeen national officers" to "seven national officers"; Article VII (National Interim Committee), change "the seventeen national officers" to "the seven national officers and one representative of each regional chapter"; Article V (National Officers and Staff), change the first sentence of section 1 to read "the national officers shall be the President, Vice-President, and five other members of the National Council."

ARGUMENT. The present NC structure has been nonfunctional not merely from the viewpoint of seldom acting, but also because it has in no sense been an organic part of SDS. Of the 15 at-large National Council members, only 1 is an undergraduate student. Some others have been active in REP, CIPA or ERAP projects, but this activity has not in any sense been related to their function as NC members. While the at-large members have on occasion made up 20-25% of the voting strength of the NC, they have been responsible to no constituency except the last convention, a dead body. I wasn't at that convention, but I understand the voting was rather frantic. With 17 people to elect, such elections tend to take on the character of either a popularity contest or a recognition poll. By reducing the number of at-large NC members, it should be possible to hold the elections with a more balanced consideration of each office and the person who should fill it, and make the NC more representative of chapters and less of "notables".

At the same time, there is a need for a National Interim Committee which can truly reflect the organization. During the recent student strike poll, most NC members were very tentative in their statements, and expressed doubts as to their ability to gauge campus sentiment or the possibility of a successful strike. A NC delegate elected by a Regional Council, and reporting back to it, would be far more representative and far more functional in terms of the real needs and desires of the membership. He would not need to be an at-large NC delegate, because his constituency would already be represented thru their chapters.

An argument frequently advanced for the big at-large NC delegation is that it provides one of the few ways ERAP people and others not involved in chapter work can participate in the organization's activities. Here, is, however, nothing to prevent ERAP staff people from forming chapters (which would certainly be functional SDS groupings, much more so than the average chapter) and receiving representation like anyone else. In any case, people who are not NC members have always been able to participate in the NC's deliberations.

2. My first minor amendment would add to section 2 of Clark Kissinger's proposed Amendment 6 the following words "and one representative of each regional council."

that a Regional Council function regularly in order to be recognized as such. It would also ensure a genuine constituency for my proposed regional NIC members.

3. My second major amendment would preface the present section 1, Article VI (National Council) with the letter "a" and add a second subsection as follows:

"(b) Five or more members residing in an area where there is no organized chapter may meet together to elect a delegate to the National or Regional Council, provided that (1) a certification of the meeting and election, bearing the signatures of at least 5 members, be sent to the national or regional office prior to the NC or RC meeting, and (2) evidence is offered that all SDS members in the area concerned received prior notice of the meeting and election."

ARGUMENT. This is directly counterposed to Clark Kissinger's proposal for regional NC elections. While an eventual regionalization of the NC, converting SDS into a truly federal body, is probably desirable in the long run (and a logical continuation of our present development), it's not very practical at present. Only about 1/3 of SDS members live in what could be called "organized regions" even by our present loose standards. The rest would be in Clark's "electoral regions". I would submit that such "electoral regions" are basically unworkable.

Nearly every organization of the "old left" experimented with some form of representation for at-large members, whether on a national or regional basis. The results were almost always disappointing. Where at large members can elect any member of the organization to represent them, they have in the past tended to elect the better-known members or campus travellers. Where they may only vote for one of their own number, it's a guessing game of sorts, since brief biographies and political statements sent along with a mail ballot are poor substitutes for face-to-face meetings and discussions of issues. Since at-large members have their main organizational contact with the national office, they have in most cases tended to be solid supporters of whatever "national leadership" existed. The problem is that democracy doesn't adapt itself very well to the postal system, and only a videophone hook up could make a mail ball of participation.

What's the alternative? We could have a national rank shipment and a national

gates. The most logical place to have such a meeting would be in the spot that the largest number of people could get to—say the site of the largest chapter in the region. The members of that chapter would know each other and have engaged in discussion. They would naturally elect one or more of their people as NC delegates. At-large members might have a greater feeling of "participation", but they wouldn't have any more representation. Small chapters near large ones would probably lose representation.

I think that it's possible for at-large members to get together and hold discussions, and would hope that they would do so on other occasions than election meetings. I think that the problems of doing so are best met on an ad-hoc basis by local people, and not on the basis of arbitrary regional lines drawn from the N.O. and subject to all sorts of gerrymandering problems. (Do Florida, Georgia and Alabama each get an NC member, or do you combine the 3—which have a total membership of less than 100—into one district? The first gives them disproportionate representation compared to NYC or Chicago. The second gives them a "region" in which a democratic election is impossible.) I propose that where at-large members are able to get together, they be given representation on the basis of the number of people at the meeting, rather than any theoretical constituency. I see this as a first step toward chapter organization and regional activity in areas which are now unorganized or poorly organized. Until we have solid, functional regional bodies, the chapter must remain the basic unit of national SDS.

4. My second minor amendment would change Article III (Membership) to begin "Membership is open to all", deleting the words "students, faculty and others." A sizable number of SDS members (I estimate) are "others", and would be left out of the parochialism of the present wording.

5. My third minor amendment would change Article IX (Procedure) to begin "by adding the word 'and' before 'and'." This amendment would be a technical one, but it would be a necessary one. The word "and" is used in the Constitution to indicate that two or more things are to be done together. In the present wording, the word "and" is used to indicate that two or more things are to be done separately. This amendment would change the word "and" to "and/or" in the Constitution, thus making it clear that two or more things can be done together or separately.



# reply to communist convention

## derisive terminology and lack of ideology

I found J. Clark Kissinger's article "Communist Convention Report" an interesting insight into the Communist Party Convention in New York. I use the word "interesting" describing it because I cannot call it "accurate" nor can I call it a completely "false" interpretation of what took place. I attended the convention as an invited observer so observed the proceedings from the same "perspective" as Mr. Kissinger. However, I obviously didn't see the same things as he did. In writing here I am only discussing points which Mr. Kissinger mentions in his article. If I were writing an article "from scratch" . . . presenting my interpretation of the convention and not discussing what someone else wrote, I would present different aspects of the convention than what Mr. Kissinger does . . . Perhaps I will take that opportunity at a different time.

Like to examine first Mr. Kissinger's statement: ". . . I feel the kinds of questions asked by most young people today about the party have to do with its internal functionings and democracy more than its politics." This certainly underestimates the depth of the inquiring student. New Left Organizations are based more on their individual political attitudes rather than on their particular method of internal functioning or structure. This indicates that the different students are attracted to the organization because of politics and the particular organizations approach to political problems. (The John Birch Society holds quite "democratically" run meetings). That Mr. Kissinger's article deals so much with party structure simply reflects his personal hang-up on that aspect of an organization. On the other hand I would agree that one cannot separate how the Party functions from its political program . . . but it is useless to examine function or structure without seeing upon what foundation it is built . . . namely its political program.

Mr. Kissinger proceeds in his article to raise a question, answer it negatively, then proceed to explain that, "well, maybe things weren't so bad after all."

Examples:

"Was the Convention open? Not very." followed later by this statement of Mr. Kissinger's: ". . . was given complete access to every phase of the Convention except meetings of the Presiding Committee." This later statement is exactly what made the convention. All observers were given this welcome and were free to contribute to any of the panel discussions which took place. That they had to follow the procedure of asking to be allowed to participate simply reflects that the delegates had priority and responsibility to participate and their responsibility came first. If they thought an observer would hinder the fulfillment of that responsibility they should by all means question the presence of that observer.

To the question "Was the convention Democratic?" Mr. Kissinger answers that it was a "place where consensus arising out of discussion of the local level was to be ratified." Because of Mr. Kissinger's negative approach to the convention I can't tell if he is considering this "consensus" as favorable or unfavorable for a democratic convention. One could hardly argue against the fact that a decision and policy arising from the "grass roots" local people is more democratic than one which they have no say in formulating.

"Was there real discussion in the convention sessions?" Answer: "Not of the kind the new left has come to know." A paragraph later: "This is not to say that real discussion did not go on." Mr. Kissinger is, I believe, admitting in a rather hesitant manner that "real discussion", discussion with depth and broadness on the major problems, did take place. No one would argue that the party covered all the problems facing our society today . . . (I myself submitted papers on two problems which I felt had been wrongly left off the agenda). Time is a reality and its role in limiting the total amount of discussion cannot be overlooked when one analyzes the convention. Mr. Kissinger's concept of real discussion is not quality but quantity. I personally would not have liked to see everyone of the convention speak on every subject just in order to say that that would make the discussion "real."

A few more corrections as to Mr. Kissinger's facts. There were 106 nominations for the National Committee, not 86. That the nominations went through the Presiding Committee was a means for selecting from the multitude of nominations those who would in fact represent various sections of the country and personally involved indifferent strata of American life. Isn't this the trouble

with our own Congress? It doesn't represent all aspects of American life but only the "select few".

I am wondering just what is "the line" Mr. Kissinger refers to in his discussion on the youth at the Convention. Does he imply that because Engles or Dimitroff were quoted therefore "the line" is being given? Or does he refer to the youth following the footsteps of previous humanitarians who have been striving so earnestly for a world community of peace . . . following their line of action and motivation. Continuity of struggle up the ladder of progress is a blind spot for Mr. Kissinger which I really expect him to overcome.

I was not as conscious of the absence of Negro youth as Mr. Kissinger. I was more aware of the absence of Negro women. He is right however when he says "a good percentage of the delegates were Negro". It was interesting that the convention was unable to give the exact composition of the nationality and/or racial composition of the convention. In filling out their registration forms over 100 persons left his particular question blank. A wonderful indication that they were "above" that type of identification.

Finally, I take issue with Mr. Kissinger's analysis that the youth present had not

participated in the movements of the sixties, "having been recruited directly to the party out of apathy." A statement by the party remarks that its youth growth was from those in civil rights, peace and academic freedom movements. Although the youth discussions were often theoretical as Mr. Kissinger states, but they were more in terms of applying theory to current problems . . . problems the youth were aware of because of their previous involvement.

This has been more critical of Mr. Kissinger than I had originally thought necessary to write. I hope it hasn't turned out to be a "justification" or "defense" paper on my part for as I mentioned at the beginning, I was simply an observer also. I could be critical of the convention myself, as Mr. Kissinger is, although on different points and hopefully without the negative attitude which accompanies Mr. Kissinger's criticisms.

There is a unity between theory and practice, a unity between politics and organization that ought to be looked into further by Mr. Kissinger. The Draft Program of the Communist Party could be read by him to great advantage, and I might add, to all interested SDS workers.

Rebecca Sweeney

# ideology and sds

Pasadena, Calif.

"Are we resurrectors of the best of corporate and/or humanist liberalism or do we fundamentally disagree with even the best of liberal philosophy?" (question posed in NLN, July 8, 1966).

Students for a Democratic Society is commonly believed, has no ideology. To admit that this is an illusion, one which stems from a lack of self-criticism which is a cocoon of ignorance keeps most of us secure in their own ideological blindness and reinforces their attitude toward the "sectarianism" of many in the movement (which is itself, of course, a form of sectarianism). I should like to see SDS in a historical tradition, free of ideological formulations and dogmas, as present significance and possible future.

How is it possible that a movement can be anti-ideological and yet be placed in an ideological tradition? Subjectively SDS may view itself as non-ideological when in fact an objective analysis will reveal the ideological roots of this political phenomenon. The intellectual history of SDS can be traced back to the Inter-Collegiate Socialist Society which was founded in 1905. Its organizational and intellectual roots are in social democracy and pragmatism.

Since SDS has become a mass organization a second discernable political tradition has emerged, namely anarchism. This tendency can be traced to the existential rebelliousness of the student middle class. Thus the two political "types" in SDS are the anarchists and the press release, image-conscious new liberals. The latter, despite their break with the League for Industrial Democracy, are still pampered by many old liberals of the New Republic variety who have not failed to recognize that they themselves had similar passionate beginnings.

There is very little ideological thinking in SDS. No attempts have been made to try to determine where the student group stands in relation to the historical development of the United States. The political philosophy of SDS can best be described as activism without strategy or ideology. The only analysis of U.S. society to be put forth by SDS relies greatly upon functionalism and is consequently very inadequate. Stoughton Lynd's pamphlet, "The New Radicals and Participatory Democracy," is perhaps the best statement of the political sentiments of the New Leftists. ". . . participatory democracy seems to be driving toward the 'live-in', the building of a brotherly way of life even in the jaws of Leviathan." This type of moral protest is not simply a non-ideological stance but rather is the best example of the anarchist attitudes of the rank and file in SDS. Anarchism is for these students, ". . . a posture, an attitude of mind and a style of life. Indeed, anarchism has become, in this generation, an effort to stay the hand of the 'iron law of bureaucracy', an attempt to fashion a personal code of ethics." (Living Louis Harowitz, The Anarchists, p. 26). These counter-communities are for the most part outlets for the "hang-ups" of the dis-

affected youth of the middle class.

SDS then, it should be clear, is in a historical bind. On a political level it has liberal and social democratic traditions. However with the emergence of the student revolt it has acquired a membership which has no loyalties to these traditions. In the early stages of the movement SDS was the most effective organization because of its commitment to activism. Now however when more sophisticated techniques are required, there is little evidence that SDS is capable of evolving any tactic other than activism for the sake of activism.

There are three principal reasons for the historical difficulties of SDS: 1) It has no theory of social change. To those who regard participatory democracy as an adequate theory, I should like to quote Ronald Aronson: ". . . unlike Marxian theory, participatory democracy has no analysis of society to explain why poverty, disenfranchisement, concentration of power in elites occur. Nor does it offer an analysis of the historical tendencies that may make social change possible. It provides no long term strategy for change." (Ronald Aronson, "The Movement And Its Critics," Studies On The Left, Jan-Feb., 1966). 2) It is trying to build consensus among elements of the society which do not have a direct relationship to the survival of monopoly capitalism. 3) It has acquired a student membership which is anti-political and attached to a tradition, "precipally famous for its unrelieved history of defeat in every part of the world." (Eugene D. Genovese, "Williams on Marx And America," Studies On The Left, Jan-Feb., 1966).

I will offer a prediction that the future development of SDS will see increasing conflict between its two political tendencies. The anarchists in their refusal to enter the arena of practical politics, will probably go the road of all anarchists. The new liberals face being coopted by their more sophisticated elders. In historical terms then, the politics of the New Left are transition politics in a reformist period of monopoly capitalism.

While sentiment may produce some optimism about the future of SDS, analytical thinking produces nothing but pessimism. The C. Wright Millians who had hoped for a "new ideology" may now have to accept the fact, as Juan Paul Sartre has, that Marxism is the expression of the reality of our epoch and cannot be transcended. Moreover there are today serious doubts about Mills' formulation of "plain Marxism" which would have to be a principal point for any development of a New Left ideology fusing Marxism and Pragmatism.

In point of fact, what Mills describes as plain Marxism is precisely the kind of pragmatic make-shift view of life that was alien to the spirit of both the founders of Marxism and its Russian and German advocates. (Living Louis Harowitz, Three Worlds of Development, Oxford paper back p. 133).

Thus the New Left faces a contradiction in theory as well as in reality. Limited by history the New Left is incapable of becoming revolutionary.

Tam Good

CHICAGO

It seems to be common among radicals to look with scorn upon moderates to the point that, for example, left-wing radicals generally appear more scornful of liberals than of conservatives. This may be because left-wing radicals think so little of conservatives that they do not even bother to be scornful of them. But at any rate, the repeated use of "sell-out," "white liberal," and similar terms does point to a real problem in left thinking and politics.

For we are, I fear, getting ourselves into a bind if we use those terms without defining some others first. A sell-out from what? To whom? For what ends? And, in turn, by what criteria do we judge these things?

For example, in the University of Chicago anti-ranking sit-in, those who wanted to leave after the second day were, in the eyes of most of us who wanted to stay, sell-outs and Administration sycophants. Yet in fact, there was a large group that was mostly unpolitical and might have been prematurely asked to be arrested or leave the building—and the group. Allowing the Administration to force this choice on them might have had disastrous consequences for all of us—our surprisingly large group would probably have become markedly smaller, and the Administration might have been able to pass us off more easily. Furthermore, a lot of politicization and radicalization was going on that would have been seriously slowed down if the group was split. And we had developed the sense of community so essential to real participatory democracy. Admittedly, as we saw it, and we were largely proved correct, leaving the building jeopardized all this. But we scorned the motives of those who wanted to leave, while in fact we differed for more on our comparative perceptions of the situation, the faculty, and the administration.

What both these less political people and we lacked was a firm ideology and an open mind. (I don't take much consolation that they were basically as unprepared as we were for the situation: they have the excuse of not being very political.) My point is that a closed mind even with an ideology is always regrettable; but a closed mind even with an ideology is always regrettable; but a closed mind without an ideology—with only the shadow of one—is really deplorable. But most of us cannot answer in depth the questions, what is a democratic university? What is its role in society? At what points must the dictates of law be followed? What are we sitting in for? (It wasn't until late June that we announced a position opposing the war and supporting general democratization of the university.) If over half-dozen people in our sit-in can answer these, I will be pleasantly surprised. What I suspect is that, as usual, most of us feel what is wrong but do not know what is right. At least until we have set up, far more than we have, how what we are striving for and until we have positively ruled out other methods for achieving our ends and cooperation with those seeking similar ends—we should be very wary of heaping scorn upon those who are more optimistic than we are about the future of us as not sincerely committed to democracy—which must mean both civil and justice rule and real free and not an ideological discussion (which is after all what we are out to do). I don't think we can afford to be so busy treating others as "sell-outs" when we views we listen to but do not see as sell-outs.

What I am planning for is a really open and open-mindedness—and the attitude of the former is not only a necessary part of the work, it is a cowardice, stupid by, and more so, all that does is provide a hollow which stagnant and dead. It seems somewhat strange to see so many radicals progressive people in such a situation.

1043 20 sec.

# III the other american heritage

"... the other and better problem is that of men and women and the world around are rendered free from dread of war and fear of death. Then the mind and the soul will be free to develop as they never were before."

—Eugene V. Debs

American history contains a vital tradition of radicals and radical movements; people have known in each period that things were fundamentally wrong. The tradition includes a hatred of intellectuals and maverick politicians. It also includes powerful mass movements. By placing ourselves firmly in this tradition we wish it to be known that the fight against corporate power and privilege is resumed in our time. We take up where others—populists and socialists—left off, and take to heart their belief in the common man and their hope for a cooperative commonwealth, in which fraternity would replace possessive individualism as the basis of social relations.

station in life." The reformers, according to Herbert Croly, founder of the New Republic, "proclaim their conviction of an indubitable and beneficent national future." The powerful myth of mobility has always had some basis in real experience, some people moved upward to the middle class, and others outward to the frontier. The doctrine of Manifest Destiny, an integral part of the American Dream, served as the rationalization for the conquest of the American Continent in the 19th century and for the overseas expansionism and economic empire-building of the 20th. Expansion has not only been the outlet for the energies of the country, it has served as the safety-valve whereby attention to America's own dilemmas has been postponed and the movements that demanded that attention have been sidetracked. Radicals have been right to expose the immorality of American mobility sustained by the massacre of the Indian race, or the control of Asians or Latin Americans. They were right as well when they

figure prominently. In the context of progressive movements of any period, these were often the left-wing. This is a tradition of dissent, sometimes of isolated dissent and sometimes of persecuted dissent. And, in all fairness, the tradition is more notable for its passionate involvements in cases than for its lasting intellectual contribution.

A second continuous strain is the Maverick tradition. This tradition is partly produced by the two-party system in which men have periodically appeared making lonely battle against the powerful. The maverick builds a personalistic political following, and appeals to rugged American individualism by taking Charles Sumner, who refused to join in unanimous consent to recognize any petition to Congress because the Southern delegations wouldn't recognize anti-slavery petitions.

John Peter Altgeld, the Illinois Democratic Governor who defended the Haymarket martyrs and the Pullman strikers, stands out as a man continually embracing the cause of

parties which had no access to a national society. This isolated moral stance was further determined by the maverick's position within the movement, and by "hard-line" tactics extremely critical of deviation. As a result, the Abolitionist movement never had access to political power and was largely irrelevant to the development of the Free Soil or Republican parties except insofar as the power of the moral witness and protest forced every other element in the society to confront the slavery question as the first order of business. And this was indeed their effect.

The dominant political idea of the time was western expansion. The abolitionists' moral force brought the Free Soil Party, founded in 1848, and the Republican Party to advocate containment of slavery. This meant a rejection of Henry Clay's attempt to reconcile expansion with the political realities of the time. A coalition of western settlers with eastern businessmen seeking an outlet for capital and the Labor Movement

## convention working paper: the crisis of

By examining the history of those movements with which we identify, we hope to draw lessons for our own efforts, and also we affirm the desirability of identifying with movements and men in history. Those who would study history without a sense of which side carried decent values in its time, or which point of view was correct is to deprive history of its power to teach. The difficult task of judgement is a task we accept as people committed to making values prevail in politics. History should be the property of the people, not of the historians. So we must teach the lessons we learn from our past.

The outstanding lesson is not the myth of American consensus taught in the colleges. Liberals and conservatives have adopted this view; progressive forces from the Founding Fathers have carried the American Torch and those who have dissented were either reformers soon to find acceptance for their ideas, or eccentric, anti-intellectuals, subversives and paranoids. The lineage of radicalism has been denied or obscured in psychoanalytic rationalizations: Quakers who practiced civil disobedience in Massachusetts for the principle of religious tolerance are now seen as having a martyrdom complex; populists embody a paranoid style, we are told, for suspecting a self-interested conspiracy of bankers and railroaders; of the abolitionist Charles Sumner, who was beaten senseless on the floor of the House for his views, we are told "This holy blissful martyr thrived upon his torments."

We reject as well the liberal variant of the consensus theory. We can not bring ourselves to believe that America has seen a succession of progressive victories, with reform winning all the fights. This cannot be reconciled with the empirical evidence that corporate privilege, inequality, and the foreign policy of expansion and war have survived each of these "victories" more or less intact. The story of reform in America can as easily be read as a story of defeat of radicals and mellowing of reformers. As contemporary radicals who understand only too well the need for controversy, we want to rehabilitate on the stage of history some of the old controversies between movements and entrenched interests.

Our attempt is not to describe ourselves as the next wave of progress. We are acutely aware of the tension throughout American history between the nation's liberal ideals and the reality which was the living denial of those ideals. At the time Jefferson wrote that "All men are created equal," he and the men who signed the Declaration of Independence did not have Indians, Negroes, debtors, and women in mind. But even at that time some people took the stated ideals literally and seriously, the sailors and urban mechanics of New York, upon hearing the Declaration, released the debtors from the prisons. The legislature of Massachusetts, during the Revolution, abolished slavery. This American revolutionary spirit was quickly lost.

That tension, between rhetoric and reality, has been resolved by the society through the device of the American Dream. The myth that has prevailed has held out the promise of the continent to those who were "taught in its poverty; in America a man is accorded a future, and certainly ought to be, who has not risen above his father's

argued that instead of letting capitalism choose a few Horatio Algers in the social rat-race of the survival of the fittest, the farmers and workers should, by united action, achieve an end to poverty for all those at the bottom of the society.

Our resolution of the tension is to seek the fulfillment of the democratic hope through the radical reconstruction of our own society. Like Debs, who would not fight in a war, but fought all his life "to wipe out capitalism," we reject the system and the seductions of its ideology. When we reject the liberal heritage, we do not reject the positive values it has impressed upon America: "All men are created equal," whenever any form of government is destructive to these ends, it is the duty of the people to alter or to abolish it."

As well, we affirm the value of the American dream for which radical and liberal movements have fought, both the reformers that have made the system more pliable to democratic control, such as the broadening of the suffrage, referendum and initiative, fair apportionment, and those that represent real and immediate gains against oppression, like Fair Labor Standards, Emancipation, and TVA. We recognize that the motivation for reform has been a mixed bag, that many suffragettes gave as much prominence to the argument that their votes would balance off the new votes of immigrants as they did to arguments based on equality. Our identification with these reforms is not out of any desire to make the system work more cleanly and efficiently and honestly, such as motivated most Progressive and civic reformers, but as part of a general attack on privilege and minority rule as it was for Populists and for Bob LaFollette, as well as it is part of our affirmation of democratic principles as guidelines for the new society we wish to bring into being.

Finally, our interpretation of liberalism's role in American history gives urgency to our mission, which is to build an alternative. Schlesinger's description "ordinarily the movement on the part of other sections of society to restrain the power of the business community" — is inaccurate, for liberals, in working to stabilize the system and reform its most objectionable features, have respected the legitimacy of corporate enterprise, and have merely challenged some of its practices, never its power. And power is a major concern of ours.

The one unbroken strain of radicalism in America has been among intellectuals; even when no popular movement challenged the assumptions of the prevailing order, some voices did. The contemporary campus radicalism has a great deal in common with Thomas Paine, Henry David Thoreau, William Lloyd Garrison, Edward Bellamy, Henry Demarest Lloyd, Lincoln Steffens, Upton Sinclair, Walter Rauschenbusch, Randolph Bourne, Thorstein Veblen, Charles Beard, C. Wright Mills. At times these have been isolated intellectuals, at other times part of a widespread expression, of movements for Abolition, the social-gospel, academic freedom, muckraking, or of utopian communities. This kind of intellectual opposition has been nurtured in Quakerism, in the Protestant clergy, in Judaism, in the universities. In the American history of ideas, radicals

common people, referred to by Debs as "supremely great." Debs, who opposed on principle any cooperation with reform parties and movements, could make this exception out of sympathy for a man who saw possibilities of working as Governor, or as a leader within the Democratic Party, without being confused about the principles for which he worked. During the Twenties, the U.S. Senate contained a number of mavericks from Western States — Borah, Norris, and LaFollette.

In our own time, on the single issue of Vietnam, before any of the antiwar movements were protesting, Senators Morse and Gruening were denouncing the war. While we understand that we are trying to build political power, not maverickism, we are cautious of the attitude that blinds itself to valuable allies by overestimating the ability of the political parties to discipline internal opposition. We see mavericks as genuine American radicals.

In addition to mavericks and intellectuals, there is equally a tradition of power, of mass movements sharing the intellectual's perception of the fundamental inequities of the society, and threatening, to greater or lesser extent, by their own strength, to alter the social relations between "wealth and commonwealth." It is these social movements whose history we examine most carefully, for they are the cases in which radicalism has taken deep root in American soil, a fact we wish to accomplish in our own time.

### Abolitionism

The first radical movement after the Revolution raised powerfully the issue of race. It is this question, from the inception of the Republic, that has been the most significant test of the equality we were promised by the Revolution. During the Revolution, George Washington hoped that the "spirit of freedom" would result in an end to the slave trade that had ground to a halt during the hostilities. Georgia and South Carolina stuck by the institution, and during the Confederation period, it, and the sectionalism growing out of it, were the basis of the most important divisions. This carried over into the writing of the Constitution, which consecrated the ascendancy of slave-owning and other property interests. The abolitionists saw the Constitution in these terms, "an insult to that God . . . who views with equal eye the poor African slave and his American master."

As slavery gained strength with the development of the cotton economy, an anti-slavery movement was born, with roots in the midwestern religious evangelistic movement and in New England transcendentalism. The American Anti-Slavery Society was founded in 1833, and William Lloyd Garrison founded The Liberator — the publication of the movement's radical wing — in 1831. He and his allies gained control of the Society in 1840. The movement was based on precisely those strains which have provided America with intellectual radicalism. Its political development, reflecting this "moral" constituency, was towards the detachment of the country (or if necessary the northern states) from the slavery evil. As well, the Garrisonians opposed political action or any co-operation with churches or political

seeking an outlet for the immigrant population developed. Lincoln expressed this coalition in the Homestead Act, railroad subsidies, and the Civil War.

Negroes in the North, in the wake of the Nat Turner slave revolt of 1831, were inspired to back Garrison and to participate in the abolition movement; they played a secondary role however and built their own movement with demands coming out of their more immediate perspective on the question of equality. In the South, a large number of Negro slave uprisings took place, almost always led by Freedmen and always crushed in a matter of days. The raid led by John Brown on Harpers Ferry in 1859, and the more prominent of the slave uprisings, while not practical in terms of a strategy of slaves liberating themselves, forced the issue on the nation much as the strident rhetoric of Garrison and Wendell Phillips forced the issue.

Conventional history describes this movement as "extremist." Some blame the agitators for the Civil War, making the erroneous assumption that slavery would otherwise have withered away. It certainly is true that the movement placed their goal higher even than the preservation of the Constitution; union after all had been purchased with concessions to slavery. Our sympathies are entirely with arguments such as the following made by Wendell Phillips.

"Such an evil as slavery will yield only to the most radical treatment . . . A money power of two thousand millions of dollars, as the prices of slaves now range, held by a small body of able and desperate men; that body raised into political aristocracy by special constitutional provisions; cotton, the product of slave labor, forming the basis of our whole foreign commerce, and the commercial class thus subsidized; the press bought up, the pulpit reduced to vasalage, the heart of the common people chilled by a bitter prejudice against the black race; our leading men bribed, by ambition, either to silence or open hostility; — in such a land, on what shall an Abolitionist rely? . . . Where shall our church organizations or parties get strength to attack their great parent and moulder, the Slave Power? . . . The old jest of one who tried to lift himself in his own basket, is but a tame picture of the man who imagines that, by working solely through existing sects and parties, he can destroy slavery."

"Experience has confirmed these views. The Abolitionists . . . have but to point to their own success . . . Slavery has been made the question of this generation."

The question of race persisted, not all of the Abolitionists saw their job as extending beyond emancipation. A few, like Phillips, as an agitator, and Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens as politicians, advocated the distribution of land to freedmen, the extension of suffrage. Others, like Garrison, even favored dissolution of the slavery societies a third of the way, as bringing aid to individuals, teaching agriculture and other trades out an honorable way. In the aid to fugitive slaves, the period of the Civil War, the abolitionist spirit was changed as suggested by the

(continued on p. 16)

...a powerful  
...or was noted  
...s of northern capi  
...1875 reached a meeting of  
...Southern while upper class  
...d to dismantle Reconstruction.

The Civil War was a period of extraordinary economic development, led by the northern capitalists who had won the war. In the 1890's bankers and industrialists replaced the broad mass as the dominant economic leaders. But this period was marked by tremendous social costs of development, seen throughout the society. Wars to eliminate the Indians were pursued with greater brutality and thoroughness than ever before. In the South, forms of industrial oppression replaced slavery. One of them was the provision of Negro convict labor to companies like Tennessee Coal and Iron. The depression of 1873 was a deep crisis affecting workers and farmers alike: it created tremendous unemployment which by 1877 erupted in strikes and riots. President Hayes sent Federal troops into Pittsburgh in the "bread or blood" riots following a prolonged railroad strike. The exploitative practices of the railroads combined with falling prices to create farm depression; in reaction, the Greenback Party gathered a million votes in 1878 on a platform of money inflation.

#### Populism

The populist movement was the first radical response to the new conditions of ruthless industrialism. It arose in the 1880's in the Farmers Alliances protesting the power and practices of the railroad industry, and the national government's economic policy of favoritism to the Eastern banking interests. The agricultural depression of the late '80s brought 6 million farmers into the Southern, Colonial and Northern alliances by 1889. Unquestionably this was a mass movement of impoverished farmers, and it soon turned to political action to secure its program.

...ism although he put forth the full Populist program, the first labor controversy of Cripple Creek illustrated to the state and country the radicalism of the People's Party. To break a miners strike against Rockefeller interests, the Sheriff requested troops, which the Governor withdrew after inspecting the situation. 1200 armed Sheriff's deputies then faced a similar aggregation of armed miners. The Governor fraternized with the miners, criticizing "Damn Capital", and a showdown was barely averted. The Pullman and Homestead (Pa.) strikes also elicited wide Populist support.

The concern for the poorest people was demonstrated by another Populist Governor, Alonzo Lewelling of Kansas, in his *Tramp Circular* of December 1893. This instruction to city police against vagrancy laws analyzed the condition of the tramp as the natural outcome of selfish capitalism. The monopoly of labor saving machinery and its devotion to selfish not social use, have rendered more human beings superfluous, until we have a standing army of the unemployed numbering even in the most prosperous times not less than one million able-bodied men. Populists also supported Coxey's Army, the 1894 unemployed march on Washington.

In 1894 the Republicans defeated the Populists through the midwest as the Democrats and silverites refused to enter into fusion arrangements. In the South, although widespread vote fraud took place against Republicans and Populists (usually fused), these were reversed by the Republicans and Populists in both houses. Overall, the outright Populist vote increased to 1,471,590 in North Carolina, where a fusionist state legislature was elected, Negroes took high state office for the first time anywhere in the South since Reconstruction; in some counties Negroes captured the bulk of local offices. On the basis of this victory, racist Democrats drummed up a scare campaign throughout the South which damaged Populism a great deal.

#### American Socialism

The idea of socialism achieved deep roots in American soil in the first two decades of the Twentieth Century. Its forthright agitation for the abolition of capitalism and its wage system, and for the establishment of a cooperative commonwealth, accompanied by the radical unionism of the period, provide an effective counter-example to the idea that radicalism cannot grow without major economic depression.

This was pre-eminently a period of the consolidation of corporate capitalism. The combined power of the railroads had weathered the great challenge of the American Railroad Union in 1894. The Pullman strike, involving over 100,000 workers combined in an industrial union, was ultimately broken by the issuance of a sweeping injunction against the Union, and by the dispatch by President Cleveland of troops to run the trains. Two years later, the money power put across its Presidential candidate-McKinley—in the face of a Democratic Party that had repudiated Cleveland. The predominance of the railroads was overshadowed in the last years of the century by an industrial merger movement creating huge trusts in steel, oil, agricultural implements, meat packing, and copper. Eugene Victor Debs and other leaders of the ARU formed the Social Democracy of America, which later became the Social Democratic and then the Socialist Party with the influx of independent Socialist movements from Texas and Oklahoma that grew out of Populism, and from the East that had split off from the sectorian Socialist Labor Party.

The Party elected two assemblymen and a Mayor in 1900. Right up to the War, its strength increased steadily. From the outset, however, it straddled a number of issues, containing a number of factions but never coming under the thorough control of Left or Right. It included many leaders of old-line craft unions, who believed in boring from within the American Federation of Lab-

control  
ing actual com  
interests in the case  
of Corporations had  
what IR called "good trusts"

Meanwhile, the Socialist movement grew. Debs received 97,000 votes in 1900, 420,000 in 1904 and in 1908 900,000 as an institution: its press exceeding in significance even of the Populist press spread throughout the country. The *Appeal to Reason*, a weekly read by farmers and workers alike, reached 250,000 circulation before Debs joined it as a columnist in 1905. These spawned the Intercollegiate Socialist Society (the lineal predecessor of SDS) in 1905, and the Christian Socialist Fellowship. In 1908 Debs had his own campaign train, the Red Special, touring the country.

Throughout the Progressive period the Socialists maintained a running criticism of reform attempts. As long as "capitalist ownership of government" persisted, they saw no promise in the reform proposals. Upton Sinclair's sentiment about the "reforms" of the stockyards that his muckracking was credited with prompting was "I am supposed to have helped clean up the yards and improve the country's meat supply — though this is mostly delusion. But nobody even pretends to believe that I improved the condition of the stockyard workers." This was the sentiment about other progressive legislation.

The Progressive movement had a considerable following in the urban and rural middle-class. In Wisconsin, California, and Idaho, reformers wrested control of the legislature from the railroads. In city after city similar movements tried to replace corrupt municipal practices with deon, professional government. Local reforms generally made popular government more difficult, but initiative, referendum, and recall, direct primaries, and other reforms of the state level had a democratic impact.

President Taft's more literal prosecution of anti-trust law resulted in action against Standard Oil and American Tobacco; Standard Oil

# cold war ideology

by PAUL BOOTH

In 1890, alliancemen followed a number of strategies. In the South, where the ties to the Democratic Party were strong, they attempted and in most cases succeeded in getting the Democratic Party pledged to help the farmers. 44 Congressmen and 2 Senators were elected on this platform, and eight state legislatures and the governorships of South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee fell under the control of the movement. In the plains states, independent or people's (Kansas) parties were started, or cooperation was worked out with the Republicans; here the successes were very limited. The Southern Alliancemen experienced deep disillusionment with the performance of their allies, most of whom abandoned the cause of the farmers when specific legislation was considered. That experience and the growing following of Third Party leaders like Ignatius Donnelly — veterans of the Greenback Party — led to the convening of a national political convention in Omaha in July, 1892, to found the People's Party.

The entry as a Third Party had varied impact. In the South, this was quite a radical step, due to the Negro question; the failure of the "Force Bill" in 1888 in Congress meant that racists had free rein in depriving Negroes of the franchise. The Populists championed Negro suffrage, and Tom Watson held multi-racial meetings up and down Georgia in behalf of the national ticket. The Democratic Party machinery stole and bullied its way to victory in the states where Populism had strong following. General Weaver, the Presidential candidate, gathered 22 electoral votes, over one million votes, as the Populists elected Governors in North Dakota and Kansas, and by virtue of their Free Silver stand carried Colorado. Ten Populist representatives were elected. With the panic of 1893 the threat of Populism and the appeal of both its radical platform and especially of the proposal for the free and unlimited coinage of silver increased rapidly. The strict adherence of the Democratic Cleveland Administration to "sound" monetary principle thoroughly alienated Southern populists from that party. In the west, however, the Populist state administrations met with great difficulty and were isolated and outmaneuvered by the other parties, causing many mid-western populists to seek their salvation in fusion.

1. Colorado, where Davis Waite had been elected Governor through free-silver en-

As the 1896 elections approached, the party became even more radical. Leaders urged a third and date backing all the demands of the Omaha Platform which called for free silver and government ownership of railroads, graduated income tax, postal savings banks, publicly owned telephone and telegraph, initiative and referendum, abolition of Pinkertons and strike-breaking armies, shorter labor hours, direct election of Senators, female suffrage, etc. On the other hand, Fusionists urged cooperation with the Democratic candidate Wm. Jennings Bryan, who was close to Populism. The Party convention voted to nominate Bryan but to add Tom Watson as the Vice-Presidential nominee, in hope that the Democrats would drop the Eastern Banker who held that spot on their slate.

It turned out that Bryan refused even to accept the separate Populist nomination because of the embarrassing presence of Watson. The Populist party machinery was in the hands of firm fusionists, who built no significant national campaign independent of the Democratic Party campaign — despite the great disparity in platforms — and who sought to combine slates of electors in as many states as possible behind the Bryan candidacy. These compromises were fairly unavoidable because of the strength of major-party organizations during a Presidential campaign. The gamble, that Bryan would win and bring tangible gains to the Populist movement, failed. Remaining in control, the Fusionists refused to convene another National convention to rebuild the Party. Splits took place, and combined with the prosperity during the McKinley Administration and the efforts of the Democratic Party to retain ex-populists, the movement fell apart.

The monumental contribution of the Populist movement was its identification of the control of the government by the business class. They saw in their time that "the fruits of the toil of millions are boldly stolen to build up colossal fortunes for a few, unprecedented in the history of mankind; and the possessors of these, in turn, despite the republic and enduring liberty. From the same prolific womb of governmental injustice we breed the two great classes — tramps and millionaires."

Their proposal: "We seek to restore the government of the Republic to the hands of the plain people" — is as relevant today as then.

er and who in 1912 controlled 1/3 of the federation, as measured by the vote of the Socialist candidate, Max Hayes, for president against Gompers, as well as advocates of industrial unionism like Bill Haywood of the western miners and the Industrial Workers of the World, until his expulsion from the executive committee in 1913 over the issue of sabotage. It offered local candidates in dozens of states on programs emphasizing immediate demands, electing Mayors in towns and cities, while it also had a Left-wing faction demanding only the abolition of capitalism.

The Socialists' major basis of strength was in the unions. In 1902, a resolution advocating the overthrow of the wage system received 4171 out of 12070 votes of the AFL convention, reflecting socialist control of the brewers, mine workers, and carpenters unions. At the same time, Debs and Haywood were organizing the American Labor Union and later the Industrial Workers of the World, on the basis that the AFL, under the leadership of Samuel Gompers, was cooperating with industrialists rather than fighting them. The major agency for that cooperation was the National Civic Federation, in which executives of the trusts and labor leaders jointly developed a progressive program and movement for the rationalization of industrial capitalism. Through arbitration of potential strikes, lobbying for workmen's compensation and the Federal Trade Commission, and the elaboration of progressive ideology, the Civic Federation sought to establish labor peace and working-class acceptance of the prerogatives of corporations. Socialists, whether boring from within or without the AFL, argued that capitalism should be replaced, not reformed.

That some change would have to come about was increasingly clear. Muckrakers exposed the excesses and brutalities of the trusts in books like *The Jungle*, *Wealth against Commonweal*, *The Shame of the Cities*. The industries themselves cooperated in many cases with President Roosevelt in working out schemes of regulation, through which the government oversaw the elimination of certain business practices. This cooperation occurred in banking, meat inspection, food and drug inspection, and conservation. With the Morgan Interests Roosevelt worked out a hands-off détente agreement. The anti-trust action against the Northern Securities Corporation prevented holding company

was broken into regional near-monopolies, and its stockholders controlled all the thirty-seven companies newly created, and American Tobacco's 80% share of the market. In 1909 was replaced by a 91% share of the Big Three in 1913. Taft's performance was unsettling enough that in the 1912 election Big Business was interested in restoring the stability of the Roosevelt administration. Three candidates emerged with progressive rhetoric: Taft as the Republican, Wilson as the Democrat, and Roosevelt as a Bull Moose. Despite all the progressive rhetoric, the Socialists received 6% of the vote, almost 900,000. All the major candidates and most businessmen advocated a federal licensing or incorporation law of one kind or another; this eventually became the Federal Trade Commission, and helped replace the informal détente system of the early 1900's.

The threat of socialism was real enough. American Telephone became an advocate of government licensing when twelve city councils passed resolutions favoring public ownership. At the Progressive convention, the key note, Senator Beveridge, made clear that "warfare to destroy big business is foolish because it cannot succeed and wicked because it ought not to succeed." Wilson's legislation, the Federal Reserve and Federal Trade and Clayton Antitrust Acts, embodied that wisdom. The Banking bill cushioned the Money Power against the weakness of decentralized banking, primarily the instability of the money market which disturbed decision-making about capital. The FTC decided to regulate "unfair competition" by giving legal advice to business on contracts they proposed, and it settled complaints against business with private conferences. Taft was also pro-business: witness the creation by his Secretary of Commerce and Labor of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

In Europe, a war was brewing, but American Socialists pretty much ignored the possibility of American involvement. The possibility was being created by the new Nationalism. From Roosevelt's adoption, our Navy and Minister's interests, and shifted Secretary's interests, opened doors to our business interests elsewhere. The Socialists' policy coupled with making the first move in opening doors that were previously closed, organizing broad-based movements, and supporting the

# anti-war groups meet in cleveland

by Dick Magidoff

Cleveland, the University Circle Committee of Cleveland, which is a group of professors from Western University and Case Institute of Technology, called for a meeting of representatives of several national organizations concerned with the war in Viet-Nam to have a frank exchange of views on strategies for the anti-war movement." By letter and phone, they invited the following organizations to participate: AFSC, CORE, Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Fifth Avenue Peace Parade Committee, the Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy (IUC), the national teach-in group, the NCC, the National Emergency Committee of Concerned Clergy, SANE, SCLC, SDS, SNCC, the Universities Committees on the Problems of Peace and War, Women's Strike for Peace (WSP), and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF).

The University Circle group felt that the time was ripe for "... a meeting of national leaders to consider a common project to mobilize the anti-war sentiments of the American people on a ... massive scale" and that "... the flow of optimism and strength is from the national to the local level. ... Only leadership on the national level, representative of the great spectrum of anti-war sentiment, is in a position to initiate a united effort around a single project which could capture the imagination and enthusiasm of a vast segment of the American people." All of the groups invited sent representatives except, sadly, SNCC and SCLC. As an at-large member of the NC, I was present for the entire meeting. Coral McDowd, Paul Potter, and Cynthia Wegman also attended substantial parts of it. Some of the others attending were truly national representatives, some were organization members who live nearby: Matt Thomson from AFSC in Dayton, Ruth Turner and Art Evans of CORE's National Action Committee, Dorothy Nyland of Cleveland FOR, A. J. Muste, for the 5th Avenue Committee and CNVA, Douglas Dowd, of Cornell, president of the IUC, Frank Emspck, Joan Levenson, and Alicia Koplow of the NCC from Madison, Dick Fernandez, executive secretary of the Clergy Committee, Paul Olynick of Cleveland SANE, Otta Feinstein of the Universities Committees, Olga Penn of Detroit WSP, and Rosa Kuerti of Cleveland WILPF. Sue Berkley also came from Boston representing Massachusetts PAX, New England Voice of Women, and the Greater Boston Area CEWVN.

The issue of exclusionism in the peace movement was raised early in the meeting by Doug Dowd. He suggested that the principle be for no one to be excluded as long as they do not wish to exclude others. The anti-war movement is not strong enough to turn its back on anyone interested in seeing the war in Viet-Nam end, and anyone should be allowed to participate in the planning of any large-scale action. The only exclusionism, then, would be self-exclusion, i.e. any group which felt it could not go along with whatever plan was arrived at. There was, believe it or not, no voiced disagreement with this principle, though a couple of representatives stressed that they could speak for themselves only, and not necessarily for their national. Paul Olynick of SANE especially stressed this. The easy resolution of this issue was one of the noteworthy aspects of the meeting, considering the range of organizations represented. As a result, Hugh Fowler, National Secretary of the DuBois Paul Lodica, active with the Cleveland CEWVN and a National Committee member of YSA, were contacted and invited to the rest of the meeting.

In concrete terms, the result of this meeting was that the idea of some kind of large-scale action was worth pursuing, and a follow-up meeting to work out the details was scheduled for August 20-21 in Cleveland. The local arrangements will again be handled by the University Circle Committee, but the IUC volunteered to handle the communication and coordination end in Ithaca. On the basis of the non-exclusionist sentiment, and desire for maximum participation, an effort will be made to broaden the number and scope of organizations to be represented at this follow-up meeting. Any one who wants to suggest some group whom they think should be represented at this next working meeting should write directly to IUC, P. O. Box 701, Ithaca, N. Y.

The participants agreed that the program to be developed would be based on an

analysis put forth by Doug Dowd: just to demand negotiations in Viet-Nam is not realistic since in fact present US policy aims appear to be a "military victory" in VN, and the establishment of a permanent base in SE Asia, with the possibility of a war with China in mind. It must be made explicit that the failure of negotiations to take place is not simply the result of misunderstandings or Communist intransigence, but also because of the nature of US policy aims. We must address our protest against these aims, and not just against the war, so our demands must include the ultimate withdrawal of US military forces from VN. We must also recognize that these aims imply a continuing militarization of American society, so our protest must also address itself to domestic issues. It must try to involve other groups "representing other dominant issues like civil rights, and poverty. Our actions must be aimed at the American people since we have little hope of directly influencing the policy-makers and those that support them, except possibly through a massive shift in public opinion.

With this in mind the task of the follow-up meeting will be to refine the general idea of a massive mobilization of anti-war sentiment, non-exclusionist in principle, multi-issue in nature. The questions of whether it should precede or follow the elections was left open. So as the question of locale or locales, though the general sentiment was that another March on Washington would probably not generate the best response.

There are several problems about the meeting that should be pointed out. Of course there was no one there who could make any real commitment for his organization regarding this massive mobilization. But also few people felt that even by August 20 would their organizations be able to make such a commitment. In that sense, despite the meeting being billed as one of representatives of national organizations, aimed towards a new and broader anti-war mobilization, it in fact was another ad hoc meeting of individuals from potentially interested organizations. (This should not detract from the fact that it was a very broad representation of anti-war sentiment). It was pointed out by myself and others, that there are already other anti-war activities in the

offing for the fall, like the idea for a student strike, and the involvement of many anti-war people in "peace campaigns". This means that organizations with limited resources would ultimately have to decide where most of their energies would be directed. This also detracted from the immediacy of the kind of broad peace movement action that was projected.

Frank Emspck in particular was concerned about the top-down thrust of the plan. He suggested that it was the people at the local levels of the anti-war movement who would be the final decision-makers about the feasibility of such a project. Several of us agreed with him that the idea of such a "mass mobilization" called by national leaders might prove a bust and do the peace movement more harm than good, if the experience and enthusiasm of local people were not drawn upon.

Perhaps most importantly, we SDSers were very excited about the general acceptance of the idea that the war in VN and US foreign policy aims had many domestic repercussions, and that it was important to reach out to those non-peace movement constituencies who are affected by the war in their daily lives: Negroes in the ghettos, other poor people, students, consumers bludgeoned by inflation. However, it simply does not follow that just by declaring a multi-issue project, and by adding a few slogans to the placards, like "freedom now" or "end poverty" that you potential other anti-war constituencies. Despite its multi-issue intent, this "mass mobilization" would still be perceived as another peace march unless some real way of bridging the gap between traditional peace movement forces and these other groups is found. In this light, the absence of SCLC and especially SNCC, was especially dramatic. The problem of this gap between the peace movement and its potential allies was not discussed. Hopefully it will be at the follow-up meeting, especially if other organizations are interested and sent representatives.

There was a consensus recognition of the need to take into account the domestic repercussions of the war was exciting. But in terms of representing any outstanding

departure from peace movement tactics, this meeting reflected little that was new and different. For several hours, various ideas were batted around (one of the most interesting was Otta Feinstein's that any large-scale anti-war action will be most effective in getting the public's ear if it is called by the clergy). But none of them adequately dealt with the basic problem of how to relate the concern for an end to the war in VN to the everyday concerns of the millions whose lives are affected by that war, especially through a massive national action. It's one thing to recognize the growing malaise about US policy in VN; it is quite another to translate that malaise into a "peace movement."

Steve Deutsch, a University Circle Committee member sitting in on the meeting very astutely pointed out why it seemed so easy to latch on to the idea of a large-scale demonstrative action: everyone shares the concern with what is wrong with American society, and everyone recognizes the futility of political action per se to do anything much about it. The large-scale demonstration idea is the result of the desperation and frustration we all feel. He pointed out that such dramatic actions are worthwhile and important, but should not be regarded as any kind of panacea. This by and large parallels my response to the idea.

SDS should certainly send someone to the Aug. 20-21 meeting, at which there should be many more groups represented. These should include other radical groups, as well as groups whose main concern is with other issues. Hopefully some unions will send representatives. Anti-poverty groups will be contacted, and civil rights groups as well. Probably the SDS person who attends this follow-up session should be someone who has had more intimate involvement in anti-war activities than those of us in Cleveland. The decisions and plans that come out of that meeting should be brought to the Convention and the NC to follow. Any final decision regarding the extent of SDS participation in and support for such a proposed project must be weighed against other program proposals and priorities and must be discussed in light of SDS's fundamental concern with building a domestic movement to change American society.

## referendum democracy: a proposal

If SDS wants to let the people decide then forget representative democracy and try referendum democracy. Let everybody who wants others to cooperate with him on some venture define it in writing and send the definition to New Left Notes. Let New Left Notes then publish the proposal of the wished-to-be-common goal. Then let anybody interested send in a vote on the proposal. A significant vote of yea puts the proposal into the SDS constitution or platform or however it should be called. A significant majority vote of nay takes the proposal off the list of proposals up for general vote.

By significant I mean the statistical measure of significant probability that the total membership would vote a majority in the same direction if it had all voted. The measure is based on the proportion of yea or nay votes, the total number of potential votes (or SDS members) and the assumption that the votes received are a random sample of the total potential votes. If SDS staffers get tired of counting votes let the voters use mark-sense IBM cards and count them on a computer (or sorter, since it would be much cheaper). Let voters change their mind if they wish and recast their vote. Computers can easily keep the records necessary to make this possible. If too many proposals are received then set a quota and then use representative democracy, in the form of randomly selected juries of voters, to select the best proposals from those submitted. That is, publish only the number of proposals per issue of New Left Notes permitted by the quota, and publish those receiving the highest percentage of yea's in their preliminary votes. And as for the question of whether a random sample of voters would include a high enough calibre of representatives... well, either you're wanting democracy or you're not, and a "highly qualified" representative is just another power-hungry, glad-handing, lying put down artist. That is, unless SDS wants to require a minimum

IO of otherwise randomly selected representatives. And if SDS keeps building up its hierarchical organizational structure of staff and representatives the way it's been doing, it's going to end up being another bureaucratic, authoritarian, reactionary bunch of cynical, pompous, fuddy-duddies just like every other organization that has grown to any size and used the traditional "democratic" organizational structure. And don't let the "inhumanity" of computers, sorters, numbers (proposals should be numbered to make voting and publishing of voting results easier) and statistics prevent the realization that such methods are indispensable for the difficult task of generating common goals that we all know are common, and that we all know we ourselves created and weren't just induced in us by mass media.

The togetherness of a convention hall full of posing and jabbering representatives is all very nice, and induces in one fearfully sentimental fantasy-remembrance about the origins of democracy (in this country) in our frontier town-meeting halls, but sufficiently real manifestation of common goals of millions or even of merely hundreds of people takes new techniques. And it takes inhuman techniques like continual countings of many, many votes on many, many issues. The reason why organizations like SDS arise in the first place is that the old techniques of cooperative decision making don't work in the older organizations. So why perpetuate the vicious cycle it never gets anywhere except closer to mass extermination and to more subtle and effective fascism.

Let SDS keep its personal participatory democracy at the grass roots, but let's not try to make it work for millions or once. Millions simply can't interact on a personal basis except in the fantasies utilized by demagogues, etc., to manipulate and disenfranchise the millions.

How the hell can a representative even know what his constituents think? The few

polls that are done these days are a pitiful measure mostly of the pollsters' bias and of manipulation by mass media. Not that representative always says he knows what the people want because he's one of them... like LBJ. It's more likely to work the other way around... the people are like LBJ.

The actual variety of issues and opinions is so great that we'd need thousands of representatives just to have one for each of their more frequent combinations. What we have instead is a rallying of our "representatives" around their own private common need to evade the real issues that they have no way of either knowing or representing or reconciling into effective cooperation and government. The drama is great fun for the representatives... it's the honey that draws the representative kind of fly.

How about SDS representatives? They're in a flush of sincerity now, but wait till this month's slogans fade and they have only their importance to hang on to if it always happens. The taste for a bit of power and glory is always acquired. That's why it's so important to take a vow of voluntary poverty and relatively selfless hard labor so as to remove from oneself the seductions of the establishment. The organizers of SDS chapters and projects just gather their sanctuary set up for their attempt at social sanity when along comes the bit of establishment that's in all of us saying "look man, what you've done is great and noble and so now we'll give you a grade 'A' and a pedestal so you can be taken over by that bit of pride that's been in you all along and start feeling better than other people. You know you were some thing special all along and obviously that's why you did all this in the first place and it's your duty to be a leader and stand there and help the establishment... the masses feel like the insignificant... the dependent schmucks that all us daddy... truly know they are." And so now all these people can start scrambling... (continued on page 33)



# radicalism: old and new (cont.)

11 AUGUST 1966 page 71

...d also tends to induce members of the New Left, disenchanted with the failures of the Old Left, to condemn the latter's existence in toto, thereby failing to distinguish the positive from that experience from the negative. The result has been profound confusion in the examination of this history.

It is startling, for one who has lived through the period, to read an analysis by a radical of the destruction of the Left in the labor movement which fails to take account of the cold war and McCarthyism — and the manner in which the U.S. Communist Party's conception of a monolithic world communist movement led by the Soviet Union operated in relation to these factors. Aronowitz's anxiety to use history to reinforce preconceived conclusions led him to ignore this; it also led him to juggle elementary facts.

After describing the wartime collaboration of the Left with trade union bureaucracies, government and employers in the interests of the military conflict against the fascist axis, Aronowitz asks: "Is it any wonder that when the Left finally decided to make its fight after the war, they found few sympathizers among the rank-and-file, and, with some exceptions were effectively squelched in three or four years?" It is thus implied that the Left came out of the war in a weakened condition. (I will leave aside the rather cavalier manner in which the grave fascist threat of the '30s and early '40s, domestic as well as foreign, is often brushed aside by members of the New Left.) Aronowitz is wrong about simple fact. The Left reached the height of its power after the war. The C.P., together with its youth affiliate, registered its greatest membership at its 1948 convention, close to 100,000. The Left dominated the leadership of 11 international unions, and many locals and district councils of other unions. The Communists and associated groups had a network of newspapers in English and a variety of foreign languages as well as weekly and monthly journals. The Left was dominant, too, in several relatively powerful mass organizations, with an estimated membership in the neighborhood of half a million. And in 1948 it made its most ambitious independent political effort through the Progressive Party.

It was also then, however, that the cold war developed in earnest, and with it the anticommunist hysteria which had its initial legal expression in the first round of Smith Act arrests of Communist leaders in the summer of 1948. The unions under Left leadership were expelled from the CIO, principally because of their opposition to the Marshall Plan and their espousal of Henry Wallace's candidacy for President. The dominant labor leadership and the Government successfully isolated and shattered the Left with the aid of the McCarthyite atmosphere, such measures as the Taft-Hartley

anticommunist oath, the massive operations of both House and Senate witch-hunt committees, and judicial prosecution of Left labor leaders. It should be noted that the international unions expelled from the CIO — whose Left activists did not have to make the choice, defined by Aronowitz, of "surrendering their beliefs or getting out" — were, in the main, also quickly torn to shreds in the prevailing atmosphere. Aiding the process was the relative stability of the economy and a rise of living standards for organized labor, contrary to widely-held opinions that postwar depression was around the corner. The Communist leadership, which dominated the Left generally, was too inflexible, too doctrinaire in its theoretical outlook and too heavily weighed down with an insulated, frozen bureaucracy to be able to combat effectively the process of isolation and rapid attrition.

Was this destruction of the Left successful because a prior lack of independence had deprived it of a core of radical sympathizers? This charge misreads completely the essential aspects of the history of the period, reflecting the customary error of seeking to interpret the past in terms of present circumstances.

It should be noted that the international unions expelled from the CIO — whose Left activists did not have to make the choice, defined by Aronowitz, of "surrendering their beliefs or getting out" — were, in the main, also quickly torn to shreds in the prevailing atmosphere. Aiding the process was the relative stability of the economy and a rise of living standards for organized labor, contrary to widely-held opinions that postwar depression was around the corner. The Communist leadership, which dominated the Left generally, was too inflexible, too doctrinaire in its theoretical outlook and too heavily weighed down with an insulated frozen bureaucracy to be able to combat effectively the process of isolation and rapid attrition.

Was this destruction of the Left successful because a prior lack of independence had deprived it of a core of radical sympathizers? This charge misreads completely the essential aspects of the history of the period, reflecting the customary error of seeking to interpret the past in terms of present circumstances.

## westside rebellion

(Editor's note: The following leaflet was distributed on Chicago's Westside during the recent riots. The commentary which follows is from Earl Silbar of Roosevelt SDS in Chicago.)

Chicago, Illinois

Peace on the Westside has not been broken. There has been no peace on the Westside. Police continually harass and intimidate the residents. Teenagers are pushed around and told to stay inside, to stop loitering. They are told, "Go back to school" or "Get a job". They are beaten because they are poor, powerless and black.

No one who is now condemning the riots has to accept menial \$1.25/hour jobs or try to live on humiliating, hunger level welfare checks.

No one who is now condemning the riots was raised in housing which never gets repairs. The landlords and banks making lots of money off this housing cry the loudest about property rights and violence.

No one who is now condemning the riots went to school with teachers whose fondest dream is to escape, who treat the kids like dirt. Schools in slum areas get less money per child. And the kids start out with the awareness that education is a fraud — for them education is not the path to the middle class. It is an endless boring road to the same jobs as their fathers.

Individuals in the ghetto are made to think that their problems are a result of their own failings. Corporations discriminate against black people in hiring and pay. They make good money off the slum system. Banks make high interest off of slum mortgages. Local stores make good money by selling poor quality merchandise at high prices. Are these things the result of individual failings?

AND THE POLICE ARE THE ENFORCERS. They keep the people afraid. They intimidate slum dwellers and thus keep them from believing in their own strength. Intimidated people don't think they can change anything. They are apathetic because they are beaten into it.

We will be heard to our face. We will

The Left began to emerge in the early thirties after the great economic depression had seized hold of the nation. No popular organizations existed to combat the terrible misery facing the millions of jobless or those fractionally working in the nation's unorganized mass industries. The recognized labor movement, then only the AFL and railroad brotherhoods, numbered about 2,000,000, virtually all skilled craftsmen concerned solely with maintaining their own privileged positions. Until 1932, the AFL rejected unemployment insurance proposals as a foreign, subversive plot. The tiny C. P., numbering about 7,000 in 1931, fashioned a program for the crisis and undertook to build the organization to fight for it. It was instrumental in constructing a massive unemployed movement, and was a decisive factor within and outside of the labor movement in developing the pressures and atmosphere leading to the adoption of unemployment insurance and social security, as well as of large-scale relief, low-rent public housing and other welfare measures. It built an independent trade union movement of several hundred thousand members, penetrating in a small way the open-shop basic industries which the AFL refused to touch. This helped to prepare the way for the later organization of the CIO on an industrial union basis, and the expansion of the American labor movement from 2,000,000 to 15,000,000 members, also with the direct participation of the Left. It opened the modern phase of the historic struggle for Negro equality, first by a dramatic widely-reported public trial of a C.P. member for white chauvinism; then by initiating the world-wide protest movement around the Scottsboro case, followed by stimulation of world-wide protests against several other cases of southern lynch justice and by organization of southern sharecroppers. Negro unemployed, trade unions in which Negro workers were prominent, as well as an independent movement of Negro workers within the unions. It assisted in the organization of farmers who battled military forces armed with guns, to block evictions and to win federal relief from catastrophic drops in farm prices. It was a decisive element in the organization of the American Youth Congress, probably the widest coalition of youth organizations in this country around a militant

and the troops must be withdrawn. The way to end the riot is not to get the people off the streets. The way to end the riot is to get the cops and troops off the streets.

CHICAGO COMMITTEE AGAINST POLICE BRUTALITY  
for further information call 667-4578

The ghetto insurrections may lead to positive results. The hatreds born of the slums were turned on outsiders by some teen-age youth. For once they ceased their self-destructive gang warfare. At the same time as the military power of the state showed them the inherent hopelessness of direct armed conflict, the need to organize themselves was made clear in a concrete manner. Direct, somewhat organized fighting with cops as groups rather than as hopeless individuals can lead to heightened awareness of the organized power of the people with goals of their own, not as puppets for ruling class political machines.

Some radicals will respond that fighting cops is a side issue, that the roots of the problem lie in the economic organization of society and the political structures that serve the interests of the dominant economic institutions.

The active involvement of youth, especially gang youth, in action against the obvious tools of their oppression, plus the attendant lesson about the need for organization, could lead ghetto youth into increased action against other obvious and direct exploiter-oppressors (E.g., businesses charging high credit, unfair hiring practices, welfare practices, malappropriation of urban wealth).

Specifically I foresee the possible development of slum youth gangs into guerrilla units based around neighborhood problems. Their style would probably be that of property destruction aimed at offending businesses, etc. The need of establishing rapport with adults against police crackdowns would lead to increasing politicizing of these youths as they would find the problems extend beyond targets vulnerable to their style. Furthermore they could catalyze the tremendous social power inhering in the masses of the urban poor.

program for peace, civil and democratic rights, and economic aid to the poverty-stricken. And with the development of the CIO, it was highly active in the formation of CIO-PAC as an independent political instrument throughout the nation, as well as in organizing an independent movement for members of the middle-class, intellectuals and cultural figures to work with the political labor groups. In several states, independent political parties or powerful independent groups within state major parties — with militant, radical programs — developed, in which the Left was an important force.

The essential point here is not simply that the Left contributed importantly to social reform, which it did, but that it was instrumental in building organization of the hitherto submerged, powerless, unrepresented sections of the population — organizations which fought for a share of power and influence in behalf of the specific needs of these groups. There was a vacuum of such organization in the America of the early thirties and the Left saw as its specific task the filling of that vacuum. It performed it effectively.

Infinitesimal to begin with, the C.P. could succeed only by working with sections of the population which did not accept its goal of a socialized society but collaborated on common goals. The movements involved went far beyond the confines of the Left and engaged great masses of underprivileged Americans in highly radical activity for that time. Let's remember that in 1937 and 1940 workers were still being shot down in front of steel mills and auto plants for striking.

Could the Left have made a greater contribution to the radicalization of American workers if it had agitated more for "radical solutions" — by which, I presume, Aronowitz means socialism — rather than concerning itself with CIO organization and "welfare state" reform? For more than 60 years we have had an organization devoted solely to a radical reorganization of society, the Socialist Labor Party. Does Aronowitz seriously argue that the SLP contributed more to the radicalization of Americans than the C.P.? In 1932, the Socialist Party polled close to 1,000,000 votes for President. It rejected coalition with other forces in the fight for radical reform, and in 1936 its vote fell by 75 percent. The vote may not be very important, but the drop did measure the SLP's actual decline in influence. Maintaining its socialist purity and educational lunction, it exerted far less influence on organizing the oppressed of the nation during the turbulent thirties than did the C.P. If Aronowitz wants to measure the relative extent to which the S. P. and the C. P. contributed to radicalization in current America, he might study the political histories of families of today's New Left youth leaders.

The C.P. became the dominant radical organization of the period, with a powerful impact on American life, because it centered attention on the clearly-defined contemporary tasks of such an organization, and because it worked in coalition with those who could assist in organizing the submerged, powerless masses of Americans so that they could begin to exercise some power in their own behalf. In the process it brought hundreds of thousands of Americans into contact with radicalism, many of whom remained radical and transmitted their attitudes to their children. It is a profound error, made by many in the New Left, to think that the Left could have remained anything but a futile sect had it confined itself to "radical solutions" alone, as did the SLP and to a lesser extent, the S.P. The Left declined precipitously, as noted, when its international commitments collided with the cold war ideology of the mass of Americans, including the workers in this country exhibited the same chauvinist tendencies as have workers in imperialist nations generally. Moreover, postwar developments proved many of the Left's most sacred theories to be wrong, and it did not have the boldness, the integrity or the flexibility to recognize this and react accordingly. This failure contributed substantially to the process of disintegration of the "radical system" that did have, a point which Aronowitz also failed to take into account.

It may be properly argued that the lack of a coalition, the Left failed to build sufficient independence in its own ranks, groups with which it could not identify itself. Involved in the struggle with the masses, each particular individual could not see the overall picture. The Left was not a

## referendum (cont)

(continued from page 8)

der as well, working hard to collect the new set of kudos and credentials of superiority like presidencies of socialist parties, regional directorships, Look at Me! m's Radical Movement, editor Super New For Left, etc.

And even if SDS representatives have the guts to keep such nonsense at a minimum they'll still be a futile phenomena if they don't solve the problem of what to represent. It's not the representation that's so important, or even the definition of the common goals. The people have and that should be represented. It's the generation of the goals in the masses themselves that is so important. It's how to get hundreds (in SDS) or millions (in the US) all thinking about the same problems and using a common language in an interaction that results in them all together evolving a genuine understanding of what the score is and what to do about it. A continual referendum, with a continually published up-to-date list of common and proposed goals to provide a constructive focus for the referendum-debate, might mediate the necessary mass dialogue.

And maybe SDS is just a small jolly club of do-gooders now but it could start or set a precedent for a re-structuring of democratic decision making that could make government by and for the people a real possibility. The group fun and exercises in selfishness and wariness in SDS could go on just the same or, the local scenes but if SDS is going to try to do something worth-while with its newly acquired numerality (and dangerous self-importance that goes with it) let it go for sick and lay a foundation stone that might serve as a fulcrum to lever down the

larger



# (cont) crisis in cold war ideology

Continued from page 1

led that the AFL would not win Mayors in 73 towns and cities, and newspapers (including 13 dailies in 25 towns) and legislators in 9 states. In 1913 Socialism appeared a durable and increasingly powerful feature of American society. The exuberance of the revolutionary industrial unionist wing, the IWW, is well known; in the years Wobblies moved into the East to participate in textile strikes centered in Lawrence, Mass., and in strikes in Akron and Paterson. Internal conflict, between the right-wingers interested in winning votes and power within the AFL, and the left-wingers growing increasingly harsh in their anti-capitalist rhetoric, increased in this period, marked by the expulsion of Haywood. This factionalism may have contributed to the dip in the Party's fate after 1914: in 1916 the national ticket received under 700,000 votes, and in the AFL the craft policy defeated industrial unionism by increasingly large votes.

From 1914, the Party turned its attention more directly to the War. The other Socialist Parties, with the exception of the Bolsheviks in Russia, took sides in the war with their respective regimes, abandoning any reservations about militarism. Anti-war fractions were jolled. In America, almost everyone in the Party stood against the war. When Wilson realized Germany could not otherwise be beaten, and America entered, the Party held on emergency convention in St. Louis that voted 140 to 5 (with 31 favoring a milder anti-war statement) a class-conscious manifesto of opposition to the war.

As the war developed, a hysteria of national unity took its toll on the Socialist Party. Organized as it was extensively throughout Small Town America, the Party was especially vulnerable to small-town super-patriotism. Meetings were broken up, branches could no longer operate. In Idaho a wobbly organizer was lynched. Nevertheless, the SP became the recipient of the widespread opposition to the war, with local candidates, where they could be bothered, receiving double or three times the 1916 vote in Ohio and Wisconsin. The Federal Government joined local patriots in persecution of the Socialists with Espionage Law arrests in December, 1917 of hundreds of SP leaders, including Debs himself. The Party split after the war, with one group advocating the dictatorship of the proletariat creating what would eventually become the American Communist Party. All tendencies, however, defended the Russian Revolution. In Spring 1919 the Party collected 109,000 dues, and even after the splits, Debs polled 915,000 votes from his cell but this was now 3% of the vote. An additional 256,000 votes were received by the radical Farmer-Labor candidate. The Red Scare led by Attorney General Palmer completed the elimination of the SP as a significant political factor. By 1924, it was Senator LaFollette, not the SP, who received the voters' endorsement for having opposed the War. Over 4 million votes (17%) were cast for the Progressive candidate, including most of the old Socialist adherents. LaFollette, although a consistent opponent of the War and a critic of the Roosevelt and Wilson programs, could not offer a critique of the political capitalism that emerged in the Progressive period. Had a Socialist Party with the ability to speak in relevant terms to ordinary Americans existed in the Twenties, perhaps the failure of the next radical generation to adequately understand and oppose the later developments of government-business relationships could have been avoided.

The Socialist Party in its early period was both radical and relevant. It proposed the idea of industrial democracy at a time of political consolidation of Big Business. And it carried the heritage of Populism in its respect for the rank-and-file, the Jimmie Higgses for whom it was constructed; this was also carried forward in the internal democracy of the IWW. In many respects, the radicalism of this period is our most important heritage. Debs' final statement at his Espionage trial is fully relevant today: "Your honor, years ago I recognized my kinship with all living things, and I made up my mind that I was not one bit better than the meanest of the earth. I said then, I say now, that while there is a lower class, I am in it; while there is a criminal element, I am of it; while there is a soul in prison, I am not free."

"In this high noon of our twentieth century civilization money is still so much more important than human life. Gold is god and rules in the affairs of men. I never more clearly comprehended than now the great struggle between the powers of greed on the one hand and upon the other the rising

hosts of freedom. I can see the dawn of a better day of humanity. The people are awakening. In due course of time they will come into their own...."

## The Development of Present Conditions

The Progressive period laid the groundwork for the subsequent development of the relations between business and government. The War Industries Board through commodity sections worked vigorously to coordinate production in many industries. Far from being socialist, according to its official historian "The commodity sections were business operating Government business for the common good". Herbert Hoover, both as Secretary of Commerce and later as President, encouraged private industry to develop Codes and standards that would be endorsed by the government and would indicate the direction for commercial activity. To this end he encouraged the formation of Trade Associations. As President he continued to try to move businessmen from the defense of their particular interests to industry-consciousness and class-consciousness.

The long agricultural depression of the Twenties, driving hundreds of thousands of farm families from their homes, was at the same time suggesting the limitations of the partnership conception. The partnership reflected only the interests of the most powerful organized elements in the society, and worked to sustain and reinforce prevailing power relationships in the society. With the stock market crash of 1929 this failure became a crisis in the system. Yet the means

for dealing with the crisis were borrowed from Hoover and the Progressives. The National Recovery Act added some enforcement power to the Hoover nation of codes. The Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1930 and NRA section 7a did for labor unions what the Progressive period had done for sections of business, making them legitimate representatives of an interest. The Wagner National Labor Relations Act finally created the NLRB to regulate and adjudicate the collective bargaining process through which all labor-management relations would now flow in a controlled manner.

Other emergency legislation of the early New Deal reflected the old patterns. The establishment of the Securities and Exchange Commission did for the stock market what the Reserve Act had done for Wall Street banks, including the principle of putting the affected party in control of the regulatory device. Agriculture legislation put local Farm Bureaus in control of a decentralized decision-making process aimed at reducing surplus production. The principle of "nationalization of losses", in which the government insures the private enterprise against the effects of failure, was introduced in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for banks and in a number of mortgage-guaranteeing institutions.

(Cont'd next week)

# the problem of tom kahn

Critics of the New Left, such as Bayard Rustin and Tom Kahn (Imagined "The Problem of the New Left" July, 1966) have contributed to the clarification of the distinction of the New Left. Further, they have lined the entrapments which the New Left represents for the New Left. Their descriptions of the New Left are generally accurate - but our point is to be different and what they dislike about the New Left I consider the New Left's positive contributions and what they find favorable I view as weaknesses and lack of radical development.

The foundations of any political position is its role vis a vis the US government - the left is defined by its opposition to the state monopoly system. But, for Kahn radicalism is based upon a "common assumption regarding the socially progressive character of the organized working class." Thus, to him, "The single new ideological feature of the 'New Left' - all that seems to me really new about it - is the rejection, implicit or explicit, of this fundamental assumption." Exactly! The New Left is being built upon facts and reality rather than myths and slogans. W.E.B. DuBois clearly indicated the basic role of trade unionism since the pre-civil war period (when its racism separated it from the mainstream of the American Left - Abolitionism); as DuBois noted, organized labor's objective of the closed shop and minimum wage legislation was aimed at the exclusion of the rural immigrant, white or Black. Certainly, nothing from Gompers to Meany has changed the objective of organized labor to avoid combatting the state monopoly system and to become part of it - to enjoy the privilege of excluding other workers in order to increase their own share of the spoils through working in coalition with the other interests privileged by the government.

Yet Kahn criticizes the New Left's disinterest in minimum wage and similar restrictive legislation which will intensify the rigidity of the labor market, increasing the unemployment among Negroes and poor whites - the very elements about which the New Left is concerned and which organized labor is antagonistic to in practice. The New Left properly does not share Kahn's enthusiastic implication that the unionization of bureaucrats is radical; teachers, welfare workers and other government employees, beyond their desire to increase their share of the spoils, play a central role in maintaining the system of domestic exploitation and repression. Kahn notes Tom Hayden's view "that the effect of the social legislation of the New Deal and the Great Society is to enslave the poor to a bureaucratic welfareism that leaves them worse off than they were to start with." Hayden says, "The reforms gained were illusory or token, serving

thely to sharpen the capacity of the system to manipulate and oppress... Except for temporarily boosting income for a few people, this entire reformist trend has weakened the poor under the pretense of helping them and strengthened elite rule under the slogan of curbing private enterprise."

Although such totally real analyses make the New Left the most completely radical movement in modern American history, its rejection of the Old Left's "common assumption" of the unique role of trade unionism leads to Kahn's complaint that "one again hears, this time from the disenchanted sections of the middle class, denunciations of 'the social democrats'! But what has been the role of the social democrats? They have consistently undermined the American Left; a role which they played in intimate relation with trade unionism (AFL, CIO, etc., not IWW whose positive contributions led to its suppression by the government). From attacks on radical opponents of World War I, through the suppressions of civil liberties under the rubric of red-baiting, and the assaults on radicals by the Union for Democratic Action (later ADA), to continuing 'progressive' facade for the Cold War, the social democrats and the unions have consistently coalesced with the US government. Because social democrats form the intellectual apologists in the unions and the universities, in the government and in the press for anti-Communism, one must applaud the New Left's insistence that the anti-Communism of socialists, trade unionists, McCarthyites, and Birchers 'is cut from the same cloth.'" (In this connection, libertarians would resent Kahn's smear associating them with anti-Communism - It is a distinguishing mark of a libertarian to be indifferent to Communists, whether because of the irrelevance of their position or the irrelevance of the question).

Kahn's explanation that the New Left is what it is due to a missing generation from the '50's misses the point that the Old Left was at fault in not confronting the government's repression and that the Old Left created that situation. Kahn clearly indicated the New Left's perception of this: "Thus the Communists were wrong... especially for behaving like New Deal liberals; and the Socialists were wrong for being so virulently anti-Communist." Their common emphasis on the Communist question - pro and con - and their "Marxian faith in the working class" brought about their coalition with the US government, and paralyzed them when the government dispensed with their aid. After the Communists had placed a premium on working with the government even against other radicals, and the Socialists had placed a premium on anti-Communism, working with the Establishment, however right-wing, they had disarmed themselves when the repression struck. Is it any wonder that the

## National Convention

## CLEARLAKE, IOWA

August 27th  
To Sept. 1st

Old Left had no attraction during the '50's? It is of more than passing interest, that Staughton Lynd, and there are doubtless others, came exactly from that very "missing generation"; but their opposition to the US government was beyond the coalitionist premises of the Old Left which had become irrelevant by the '50's.

Kahn relates the New Left's rejection of social democrats and trade unionism to its middle class origins. To the extent that such may be its origins, there is increased hope for radicalism as it was the youth from just such origins that provided the necessary leadership for the revolutionary movements in Russia, China and Vietnam. It was their background and education that made those leaders not susceptible to coalitionism, but led them to a radical commitment transcending the hang-ups of anxiousness about status, style and material circumstances. It was middle class youth that brought to those movements the spirit of internationalism which contributed to their successful revolutions, and which is to be found in the New Left's "amenability to cooperation with pro-Vietcong elements." (The English Left was characterized by its 'amenability to cooperation' with the pro-Yankee, pro-Concuk, pro-IRA elements against the English army; the support of the NLF and DRV which defines the present American Left is indicative of the increased maturity of the New Left compared with its predecessors.)

Kahn considers factionalism more creative than participatory democracy by which "a minority is unsatisfied with the common denominator, it is permitted to carry out its own program by itself." But this process would permit the testing of each position in the actual situations by those who believe in each position. It is a shame that it has not been applied on crucial questions of recent SDS meetings. Kahn was especially heartened by the SDS December conference's rejection of programs to oppose the Vietnam war - why did the minority not carry out its own program by itself? Similarly, with the October proposal to oppose conscription and the proposal of Clark Kissinger in June for phased responses to US aggressions, it would appear that Kahn was incorrect that SDS procedures "discriminate a priori against people who believe that an organization ought to pursue a 'integrated strategy'." It would seem to be the reverse, and that is unfortunate. The New Left generally, and SDS in particular, are engaged in hard decisions about the future. These decisions will determine whether Tom Kahn's expectation of a "new left" or whether the New Left will be the difficult task to "build a new left" or revolutionary enclaves. The question is: to build a new left or to build a new left.

# SSOC publication

SSOC has been publishing The Movement for a year and a half now. It is usually conceived as a news and information organ for the civil rights movement. From the beginning it has carried a lot of farm labor struggles as well. This feeling of unity between the Negro and white American movements of struggle has been very valuable both in education and in mustering support for the Delano grape strikers. The Schenley and S & W boycotts were organized from the offices of The Movement, and the DiGiorgio boycott supplement was used in many areas as basic literature (it was that supplement which was reprinted in New Left Notes).

Subscriptions to The Movement are \$2 per year, and bundle orders are \$3 per 100. The DiGiorgio boycott supplement is \$1 per 100, and boycott pledge cards are free from: THE MOVEMENT, 449 - 14th st., San Francisco, Calif. 94103.

The July issue of The Movement has articles on the Watts secessionist movement, DiGiorgio's phony "representation elections", urban renewal, the white house "civil rights conference", the Alameda "tent city", black power and black consciousness, JOIN's Chicago rent strike victory, and the need for land reform in California.

## SSOC minutes

Emergency NAC Meeting - July 31, 1966 8:00 P.M.

An emergency NAC meeting was called to discuss the invitation of the DuBois Clubs to attend a press conference regarding the burglary of their membership lists and files.

Present: Jane Adams, Tom Condit, Greg Calvert, Steve Baum, Earl Silbar, Stan Teplick, Roy Dahlberg

Question before the meeting, should Jane attend the press conference and participate in it?

The consensus of the group (and of Louter who was contacted by telephone) was that she should be present. Controversy centered around the question of whether we should just present a statement which Jane would read or whether Jane should also involve herself in the questioning by the press. It was finally decided that a press release should be prepared and that Jane should refer questions to that text. Calvert was asked to write up the statement which was then discussed in detail. (See Page 1.)

It was also decided that an appeal should be sent to the SDS membership to help reconstitute DuBois Clubs files.

National Office - August 1, 1966 - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: Aerlyn Weissman, Jane Adams, Paul Louter, Earl Silbar, Greg Calvert. Members absent: Paul LeBlanc, Mike James (JOIN). Others present: Roy Dahlberg, Steve Baum, Elliot Isenberg, Stan Teplick.

1. Finances. Weissman reported a bank balance of \$86.30. A new debt was reported of \$125.00 for a platemaker which had been leased in January and returned late. Since it was broken when received, it was suggested that we negotiate with the company. Calvert proposed that he be allowed to take ads up to 10% of copy in New Left Notes. He pointed out that publishing NLN was a major expense and thought it important that it be at least in part self-financing to ease the financial burden on the NO. Calvert was authorized to solicit book ads and also to run an ad appealing for contributions in National Guardian which might be paid for on an exchange basis. Calvert also reported on the costs of publishing the convention booklet. LeBlanc was unable to give report because of his absence. Concern was expressed that the project had been neglected and Calvert agreed to see that the matter was dealt with. Louter suggested a faculty-pledge campaign on which he agreed to begin work for the fall. Dues suggested that a plan for monthly or quarterly dues be presented at the NC. The possibility of a speakers bureau was also discussed.

2. Report on DuBois press conference (See Page 1). The press did not appear for the press conference which the DuBois Clubs called. It was decided that both the DuBois Clubs' statement and our own press release

## SSOC

in June at our Buckeye Cove (North Carolina mountains) Conference, we decided to become a membership organization. Not much is happening with SSOC organizationally this summer, but three projects to which we are related are going well.

- 1) The Virginia Students' Civil Rights Committee, Southside Virginia Project: A rural organizing project in the Va. Black Belt, manned by students mostly from Va. colleges, work in eight counties on voter registration, desegregation, improved facilities in black community, and jobs. Write (and send money) to VSCRC, Box 292, Blackstone Virginia.
- 2) The North Nashville Project: An urban project, manned by students from Fisk and Tennessee State Universities with help from summer volunteers and others from the Nashville community, involved in tutorials and summer freedom school. Project staff and local people have developed a playground. Near-future plans call for branching out into white community nearby.
- 3) Students and Labor Project: Growing out of a SSOC-sponsored Students and Labor Conference at North Carolina College in Durham, the project is in cooperation with the Industrial Union Department of AFL-CIO. Students and full-time organizers are working with migrants in the Middle and South Atlantic states.

In the fall all three of these programs will continue. Also, SSOC will resume its campus program and publication of THE NEW SOUTH STUDENT. We are now recruiting for the fall and are especially interested in southerners gone North to school. We're also rather anxious to raise some money. Write to SSOC at Box 6403, Nashville 37212. Contributions to SSOC for its program on the three programs outlined above are tax exempt. Ed Hamlett, staff coordinator

should be published in NLN along with a disavowal of SDS co-sponsorship. August 27 Washington action.

(The meeting was interrupted by a call from Jeff Shero in Austin inquiring about the fact that Sandra Wilson had been wounded in the shooting at the University of Texas. An immediate call was launched to contact Bob Speck.)

3. Printing: It was decided that D.C.O. should be contacted in Lawrence Kansas, and that the NAC should hold a meeting on August 11 to deal exclusively with the problem of materials to be printed.

4. Trips and conferences: Since John Maher is too deeply involved in the Adams campaign to be able to attend the mid August peace conclave in Tokyo, Quentin Bassett has been asked to attend. Feels she can raise money. Dave Dellinger can pay half off for.

It was decided that Jane should go to Atlanta Tuesday for SNCC national executive meeting to talk about South Africa program, building fraternal relations through joint programs, Institutes, etc., solicit article on Black Power for NLN. Money for the trip was obtained from Charles Fisher.

In addition to others already contacted to go to NSA, Paul Louter, Earl Silbar, Ed Jennings, and Fred Kushner of Chicago volunteered to attend.

Calvert reported that he had been asked not to attend that "meeting of local peace groups" in Pittsburgh which was not called by the NCC and which NCC staff requested him not to attend. He has asked the NCC for a letter of explanation. Frank Emspack issued the original invitation. Paul LeBlanc probably attended the meeting though he was not mandated by the NAC.

5. Staff: Aerlyn informed the meeting that she would probably be leaving the office by the 20th of August. An attempt will be made to contact an applicant in Lincoln, Nebraska. Aerlyn will write up a report on the legal situation and financial responsibilities of the NO.

6. Convention Report. Dahlberg said that a format for panels, debates and workshops has been drawn up. The five areas of concern: 1) black power, 2) working with liberal groups 3) US power in the world 4) electoral politics 5) the university. Three kinds of workshops will be offered: structured, impromptu, and those which work toward the presentation of convention resolutions.

Schedule: August 27: A party of some nature(?)  
Aug. 28-30: Panels, debates and workshops in 5 areas  
Aug. 31-Sept 1 Plenary sessions

Submitted by Earl Silbar

## publications received

WEST SIDE NEWS - Org. the West Side Organization, a Chicago civil rights group. Has an excellent account of the riots not to be found in any national publication. For example:

"The water had been turned off, yet witnesses said, when youths turned it back on. The police turned it off again, and members of the crowd asked why hydrants in the Negro area were shut off while hydrants in the Italian section along Taylor street were left on."

One policeman offered to go to Taylor street and turn those hydrants off until he was stopped by his partner who said, "they don't run things here".

THE VILLAGE VOICE (July 21) - Jack Newfield, at the end of his column, reveals how NAACP head Roy Wilkins, after having attacked SNCC's black power concept as racist and thus made the headlines, accused Robert Kennedy of undermining black power. RFK, according to Wilkins, did this by opposing the handpicked candidate for Manhattan Surrogate of Negro Tammany leader Raymond "the Fox" Jones. Stephanie Harrington has an article entitled "The New Radicalism is 'mind' with a capital 'M'". An activist who three years ago was labor organizing in Kentucky has turned to what the author terms "his post-new left, Dylan generation combination of McLuhanism and mysticism."

Bulletin OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM (July-August) - put out by The American Committee for the Fourth International, a Trotskyist splinter group. There is a very good article on the current situation as regards hospital worker organizing in New York. Otherwise this issue is, for the most part, a dull, dogmatic exposition of AFCL's position.

VIETNAM INTERNATIONAL - a new publication published by the International Confederation of Disarmament and Peace. Gives accounts of the growing world wide opposition to U. S. policy in Vietnam. Simple. The chairman of the Danish delegation to the U. N. publicly urged his government to formally disavow any support for the American position. Britain's fifth largest trade union, the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers (350,000 members), passed a resolution urging the Labor government to end support of the U. S. "in its aggression in Vietnam..."

WRL NEWS (July-August) organ of the War Resisters League. WRL sent out a questionnaire to the 5000 people on its mailing list of whom approximately 1000 responded. Among the questions asked were: (1) which national peace group do you consider most important, and (2) with which national group are you actively affiliated? Among answers to the first question, from the predominantly pacifist respondents, SDS placed fifth behind WRL, AFSC, FOR and CNVA. SDS placed second among peace organizations with which the respondents affiliated locally.

THE SOUTHERN PATRIOT (May issue): published by the Southern Conference Educational Fund. An article by assistant editor Carol Stevens discusses joint student-labor efforts at labor organizing in North Carolina, especially among employees of Duke University. Among gains made: molds won raises from 90¢ to \$1.15 hr. plus a lighter workload. Laundry workers are working 8 instead of 13 hours a day. Students helped the union, local 77 of AFSCME (American Federation of State, County and Municipal employees), by leafleting, recruiting new members, getting people to union meetings.

NEW LEFT NOTES  
Room 266  
1608 W. Madison  
Chicago, Ill. 60612  
Return Requested

Bruce Peck  
8 Hingham St.  
Cambridge, Mass.

Second-Class post  
age rates paid in  
Chicago, Illinois

summer  
national  
council  
sept. 2-3  
clearlake, iowa

there will be a credentials committee whose decisions will be enforced. All chapters should notify the NO of their NC delegates prior to the twentieth of August, 1966.

## co-op day school

A co-op day school will be set up at the convention for members with children, or, in special cases, younger members with parents. We will attempt to provide some sort of recreational facilities and a play area. Staff will have to be organized by those parents whose lives are directly affected. Please notify the NO, giving the name, times you will be at the convention and number and ages of children. Hopefully this will work to resolve the age old debate about who should stay home. Equal amounts of time will be spent by both parents.